



INOPS Survey data report for Sweden

Organisation, management and performance of road and park maintenance service provisions in Swedish municipalities

Lindholst, Andrej Christian; Severin, Majbritt Christine

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Lindholst, A. C., & Severin, M. C. (2017). *INOPS Survey data report for Sweden: Organisation, management and performance of road and park maintenance service provisions in Swedish municipalities*. Department of Political Science, Aalborg University.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

INOPS Survey data report

Sweden

Organisation, management and performance of road and park maintenance service provisions in Swedish municipalities

Authors

Andrej Christian Lindholst

Majbritt Christine Severin

Centre for Organization, Management and Administration

Department of Political Science

Aalborg University

Fibigerstræde 1, DK-9220 Aalborg

Aalborg 2017

Contents

INOPS Survey data report.....	1
LIST OF TABLES	3
FOREWORD	6
INTRODUCTION	8
MATERIALS AND METHODS	9
DATA.....	12
CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND MUNICIPALITIES	13
SERVICE PROVISION: PROVIDERS, PURPOSE AND SUPPORT	22
Summary	22
The use of different of types of service providers	24
Purposes for using private contractors and in-house providers	27
Political and administrative support.....	31
MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION.....	34
Summary	34
Formal management of private providers	36
Formal management of in-house providers	37
Management approach and relations to providers	40
Comparison of the management of private contractors and in-house providers.....	41
Organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance	44
Transactional characteristics of park and road maintenance services.....	45
Mutual institutionalization of behavioural norms	49
Organizational changes and economic pressures.....	52
PROCUREMENT, MARKETS AND CONTRACTS	54
Procurement and markets.....	55
Contracts	61
OUTCOMES, EFFECTS AND PERFORMANCE.....	64
Summary	64
Performance evaluations	66
Cost effects.....	78

Competition effects on service management and provisions.....	83
APPENDICES	85
Survey questions	86
Survey invitations and follow-up letters	159

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Respondents: Distribution according to gender	14
Table 2. Respondents: Distribution according to age groups	15
Table 3. Respondents: Distribution according to years of employment in current municipality and the public sector	16
Table 4. Distribution of municipalities in the dataset according to national region	17
Table 5. Distribution in the dataset of overall responsibilities of the respondents' departments	18
Table 6. Comparison of mean municipal size (population) in the dataset	19
Table 7. Comparison of mean municipal size (population) in the dataset (outlier excluded).	20
Table 8. Comparison of mean municipal size (population) in the dataset for municipalities > 8,000 and < 500,000.....	21
Table 9. The use of different provider types for provision of parks and road maintenance services	24
Table 10. Current distribution (un-weighted) of parks and roads maintenance budgets between different types of service providers.....	25
Table 11. Optimal distribution of maintenance budgets on different types of service providers	26
Table 12. Purposes for using private contractors (parks and roads)	27
Table 13. Purposes for using in-house provision (parks and roads)	28
Table 14. Comparison of purposes for using in-house provision and private contractors.....	29
Table 15. Evaluation of purpose of using in-house provision by different types of respondents.....	30
Table 16. Political and administrative support for contracting out.....	31
Table 17. Political and administrative support for in-house provision	32
Table 18. Comparison of political and administrative debate and support for in-house and private provision.....	33
Table 19. Formal contract dimensions for managing and organizing provision of park and road maintenance services by private contractors.....	36
Table 20. Formal instruments for managing and organizing in-house providers	37
Table 21. Size of park and road maintenance budgets (mill. SEK)	38
Table 22. Size of park and road maintenance budgets per inhabitant (SEK).	39
Table 23. Management of private contractors.	40
Table 24. Management of in-house provider.	41

Table 25. Comparison of the management of private contractors and in-house providers.	42
Table 26. Contract management capacity for managing private contractors.....	43
Table 27. The degree of organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance	44
Table 28. General transactional characteristics of services provided by private contractors	45
Table 29. General transactional characteristics of services provided in-house	46
Table 30. Comparison of transactional characteristics of park maintenance services provided in-house and by private contractors.....	47
Table 31. Comparison of general transactional characteristics of road maintenance services provided in-house and by private contractors	48
Table 32. The degree of institutionalization of behavioural norms in relations with private contractors.....	49
Table 33. The degree of institutionalization of behavioural norms in the internal relations with an in-house provider	50
Table 34. Comparison of the institutionalization of six behavioural norms in internal and external relations.....	51
Table 35. Experienced and expected organizational change	52
Table 36. Experienced and expected budget pressures.....	53
Table 37. Distributions of municipalities that in the past ten years procured road and parks services and which currently use private contractors	55
Table 38. Use of internal control bid / calculation in procurements of parks and/or roads maintenance	56
Table 39. Evaluation of the municipality's procurement and contract documents and service specifications.....	57
Table 40. Use of analysis in procurement planning.....	58
Table 41. Evaluation of three transactional dimensions of market relations	59
Table 42. Juridical / legal barriers for using private contractors (parks and roads).....	60
Table 43. Number of contracts with private contractors.....	61
Table 44. Contract length for park maintenance contracts.	62
Table 45. Contract length for road maintenance contracts.	62
Table 46. Average contract lengths (in years) for parks and roads maintenance contracts.	63
Table 47. Evaluations of private contractors' provision of road and park maintenance services	66

Table 48. Evaluation of private contractors' performance of park maintenance services by different types of respondents.....	67
Table 49. Evaluation of private contractors' performance of road maintenance services by different types of respondents.....	68
Table 50. Evaluation of private contractors' performance of park maintenance services at different levels of contracting out.....	69
Table 51. Evaluation of private contractors' performance of road maintenance services at different levels of contracting out.....	70
Table 52. Evaluations of in-house provision of road and park maintenance services	71
Table 53. Evaluation of in-house providers' performance of park maintenance services by different types of respondents.....	72
Table 54. Evaluations of in-house providers' performance of road maintenance services by different types of respondents.....	73
Table 55. Comparison of municipalities' evaluation of performance of in-house and private provision of park maintenance services	74
Table 56. Comparison of municipalities' evaluation of performance of park maintenance services between in-house provision and the performance of private contractors in municipalities which contract out 90 % or more.....	75
Table 57. Comparison of municipalities' evaluation of performance of road maintenance services between in-house provision and the performance of private contractors in municipalities which contract out 90 % or more.....	76
Table 58. Comparison of Swedish municipalities' evaluation of performance of in-house and private provision of roads maintenance services.	77
Table 59. Quantified economic effects from contracting out after last procurement.	78
Table 60. Direction of self-reported estimates on cost change from last times services were contracted out.....	79
Table 61. Distribution of direction in cost change for contracting out roads and parks according to the number of procurements in the past ten years.....	80
Table 62. Economic effects on overall service provision from competitive tendering.	82
Table 63. Effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance.	83
Table 64. Effects from the use of private contractors on municipal management of parks and road maintenance.	84

FOREWORD

This data report provides statistics on the organization, management and performance of different ways of providing maintenance services within the municipal park and road sector(s) in Sweden. The statistics rely on data collected in the period from May 2015 to June 2015 through an online survey sent to managers in all 290 municipalities in Sweden.

The data report is a part of a research project with the title '*Innovations in the organization of public-private collaboration in an international perspective with focus on technical maintenance services*' (acronym: INOPS).¹ Overall, INOPS seeks to address the following three primary research questions in relation to marketization of maintenance services within the municipal park and road sector:

1. *Which forms of contracting out and public-private co-operations are used and considered by municipalities in Denmark, Sweden, Norway and England?*
2. *Which driving forces, considerations and rationales are in play in the various countries when municipalities develop and implement various forms of public-private co-operation?*
3. *What are the requirements/conditions, advantage and disadvantages of various forms of contracting out and public-private co-operation within the individual countries and between the countries?*

A part of the output from INOPS is altogether four data report including data for Denmark, Norway, Sweden and England. The data underlying the reports provide one source for addressing the three research question.

INOPS is carried out in collaboration between researchers from Denmark, Norway, Sweden and England. INOPS is led by Andrej Christian Lindholst and Morten Balle Hansen, Aalborg University. Partners in Sweden have been Ylva Norén Bretzner and Johanna Selin, School of Public Administration, Gothenburg as well as Bengt Persson and Thomas Barfoed Randrup, Swedish

¹ The original Danish title of the research project is: '*Innovationer i organiseringen af det offentlige-private samspil i et internationalt perspektiv med fokus på kommunaltekniske driftsopgaver*' with the abbreviated title '*innovationer i det offentlige private samspil*'. The Danish acronym for the title is: 'INOPS'.

Agricultural University, Alnarp. The partner in Norway has been Merethe Dotterud Leiren, Norwegian Centre for Transport Research. Partners in England have been Mel Burton and Nicola Dempsey, University of Sheffield and Peter Neal, Peter Neal Consulting Ltd. Partners in Denmark have been Ole Helby Petersen, Roskilde University and Kurt Houlberg, KORA. The project has been co-financed by Dalgas Innovation and Aalborg University. Dalgas Innovation has been represented by Lisbeth Sevel.

Without the contributions from a long list of people and organizations it would not have been possible to carry out the various research tasks in INOPS. The partners in INOPS especially thank all employees in the municipal park and road departments that devoted some of their time to answer our survey. The partners would also thank colleagues at Aalborg University and managers in municipal park and road departments which provided feedback in the design of the survey as well as on the findings from the survey.

INTRODUCTION

This data report provides statistics on the organization, management and performance of different ways of providing maintenance services within the municipal park and road sector(s) in Sweden. The statistics relies on data collected between March 2015 and June 2015 through an online survey send to managers in all Swedish municipalities.

The data report is structured in three main sections:

- Methods and materials
- Data
- Appendices

The section on Methods and Materials shortly explains how the survey is designed, how data was collected and how the resulting dataset was analysed. In addition, the section evaluates the representativeness of the dataset.

The section on Data contains key statistics for all questions in the survey as well as some analysis of the data. The section firstly presents key statistics on the characteristics of the survey's primary respondents as well as the included municipalities in the dataset. Secondly, the section presents key statistics on how the provision of maintenance services for parks and roads are organized and managed. Thirdly, the section presents key statistics on the performance of various ways of organizing and managing the provision of maintenance services for parks and roads. The appendices contain the original (Swedish version of the survey) and the text used for invitation and reminder of respondents.

The provided statistics in the report are not intended to be read in any particular order, i.e. from start to the end. A reader is welcomed to use the list of tables to find statistics of particular interest. It should be noted that the dataset provides almost endless opportunities for generating statistics and the present report only contains the most fundamental key statistics for individual questions in the survey. However, a few tables in the report provide more in-depth analysis of key themes by, for example, comparing the performance between different ways of organizing the provision of maintenance services. Further analysis will be done in subsequent publications, communications and eventual upon request

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The dataset for the present report was collected as part of a larger research project (INOPS) on the use of various arrangements for providing parks and roads maintenance services at the level of local governments / municipalities in Denmark, Sweden, Norway and England. The dataset for the report was generated through a survey distributed electronically to all Swedish municipalities in the period from May 2015 and until June 2015.

Items in the survey were designed to uncover key dimensions of the ways service provisions are organized and managed and how various types of organization and management perform. Earlier research was reviewed in order to provide a theoretical framework for important constructs and guide the operationalization of these constructs. Several pilot tests with respondents and researchers were carried out based on draft versions and later a revised electronic version of the survey. Both the number, wording and response scales for items in the survey were adjusted according to the provided feedback. In the final survey, most items used 11-point numeric response scales with two anchors. Both one-dimensional (e.g. from 'not at all' to 'very high degree') and two-dimensional scales (e.g. from 'very un-satisfied' to 'very satisfied') were used pending on the individual item. The survey also included some items which used categorical response scales (e.g. 'yes' or 'no') as well as ordinal scales. An open response option (for comments) was furthermore included for all items.

The target population for the survey was all 290 Swedish Municipalities (N=290). Primary respondents for Swedish municipalities were midlevel managers in the municipal organization with responsibilities for roads and/or park services. One, two, or in some cases up to three, midlevel managers were chosen as respondents from each municipality due to their expected insights in operational dimensions as well as strategic dimensions of service provisions. Due to variations in internal organisation of park and road responsibilities, it was necessary to identify more than one respondent for many municipalities. List of respondents and contact details was collected through professional associations as well as inspection of websites and direct contact to municipalities.

Data collection was carried out electronically in the survey program 'SurveyXact'. An initial invitation was subsequently followed by two rounds of electronic reminders targeted respondents that didn't respond firstly as well as respondents that had provided partial answers. Finally, non-responding municipals were contacted by phone for a last reminder.

The final dataset was created by merging replies from altogether 186 respondents which provided complete or partial complete data entries in the online survey. In this process, one respondent was selected as the primary respondent for the municipality. Key criteria for selection of primary respondents were: position in the hierarchy, job title and responsibilities of the respondent's department. Any non-completed questions from a primary respondent were then eventually filled with completed questions from other respondents in the same municipality. The average age of primary respondents for each municipality was approximately 50 years with a standard deviation of 8.7 years ($N = 79$). The average tenure in the public sector and current municipality for respondents were respectively 16.5 years ($N = 83$, S.D. = 10.1) and 10.3 years ($N = 83$, S.D. = 9.2). Approximately 75 % of primary respondents were furthermore identified as males (25.2 % were females).

The final dataset included data for organization of parks and/or roads services in altogether 115 out of a total of 290 Swedish municipalities equal to approximately 40% of all Swedish municipalities. 105 municipalities provided specific data for the organisation of road maintenance and 98 municipalities provided specific data for the organisation of park maintenance. Statistical tests for differences between the included cases in the dataset (115 municipalities) and all cases in the target population (290 municipalities) revealed no significant statistical differences regarding geographical distribution across the three main regions in Sweden. There is a statistical significant difference for all municipalities regarding municipal (inhabitants in December 2014). However, when municipalities with populations smaller than 8,000 and larger than 500,000 were excluded from the analysis ($N = 100$) there is no significant difference ($p = .230$). Chi-test was used for testing bias in geographical distribution with municipalities divided into three regional categories and measures of bivariate correlation were used for test of bias in municipal size measured by inhabitants. Statistics for chi-test of difference between expected and observed cases in the regional distribution were chi-square = 1.709, $p = .425$ (two sided) and gamma = -.112 (approx. sig. = .256). Statistics for the bivariate correlation between cases in the dataset and size of municipalities were also found non-significant with a p-value = .230 when municipalities with populations smaller than 8,000 and larger than 500,000 were excluded from the analysis. Given the acceptable representation of municipalities in the final dataset (39.7 %) and the computed non-bias toward municipal size and geographical distribution, our dataset should provide a fairly representative dataset for municipalities between 8.000 and 500.000 inhabitants in Sweden.

The software package SPSS 23.0 has been used for organizing all data and as the primary tool for statistical analysis and computation of statistics. The report relies mainly on descriptive statistics in the presentation of survey data, but some explorative and comparative analysis is provided as well. All statistics is summarized in tables and/or figures. The original survey items, upon which the data generation and statistics is based, are found in a separate appendix.

DATA

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND MUNICIPALITIES

This section provides short descriptive statistics on the respondents and the municipalities in this survey as well as providing analysis of the representativeness of the dataset.

A total of 115 out of all 290 Swedish municipalities equal to approximately 40% of all Swedish municipalities are represented in the dataset. Analysis for representativeness regarding geographical distribution revealed no statistical significant bias. Analysis for representativeness regarding the average population size of all municipalities ($N = 115$) revealed a statistical significant difference ($p < .05$). However, when municipalities with populations smaller than 8,000 and larger than 500,000 are excluded from the analysis ($N = 100$) no statistical significant differences regarding population size are to be found between the two groups ($p = .230$).

The average age for primary respondents is 50.1 years and two-third of all respondents is aged between 41.4 and 58.8 years. Approximately 75 % of all primary respondents are men. Virtual all respondents are aged 40 years or older. The average length of employment in the current municipality for primary respondents is 10.3 years while the average employment in the public sector is 16.5 years. Only 36% of primary respondents have been employed in the public sector for 10 years or less while 65% have been employed in their current municipality for 10 years or less.

The three most widespread responsibilities for the departments of primary respondents are: Budget planning and responsibility (respectively 79.1% for parks and 80% for roads), monitoring of maintenance (72.2% and 80%) and operational planning (68.7% and 77.4%). The less widespread responsibility is planning, strategy and development (33% and 36.5%).

Gender characteristics of primary respondents

Table 1 provides an overview of the distribution of gender for primary respondents for all cases in the dataset. About three-fourths of the primary respondents are males.

Table 1.
Respondents: Distribution according to gender

Gender of primary respondent	Frequencies	
	Absolute	Relative
Female	29	25.2%
Male	86	74.8%
Total	115	100%

N = 115

The table shows the distribution of primary respondents according to gender.

Data is based on the following question: What is your gender?

Age characteristics of primary respondents

Table 2 provides an overview of the age of primary respondents for each municipality in the dataset. For altogether 79 cases (municipalities) information on the age of the primary respondent was provided.

Almost all primary respondents are aged 40 years or more. The average age is 50.1 years and two-third of all respondents is aged between 41.4 and 58.8 years.

Table 2.
Respondents: Distribution according to age groups

Response: Distribution according to age groups											
			Distribution in age groups								
N	Mean	S.D.		Age 30 – 34	Age 35 – 39	Age 40 - 44	Age 45 - 49	Age 50 - 54	Age 55 - 59	Age 60 - 64	Age 65 or more
79	50.1	8.7	Absolute	2	5	17	17	10	14	11	3
			Relative	2.5%	6.3 %	21.5%	21.5%	12.7%	17.7%	13.9%	3.8%

N = 79

The table shows the distribution of primary respondents according to age group.

Data is based on the following question: "In what year were you born?"

Employment characteristics of primary respondents

Table 3 provides an overview of the distribution of primary respondents according to years of employment in their current municipality and in the public sector in general.

The average length of employment in the current municipality for primary respondents is 10.3 years while the average employment in the public sector is 16.5 years. Only 36.2% of primary respondents have been employed in the public sector for 10 years or less while 65.1% have been employed in their current municipality for 10 years or less.

Table 3.
Respondents: Distribution according to years of employment in current municipality and the public sector

Respondents: Distribution according to years of employment in current municipality and the public sector									
				Distribution for years of employment in municipality and the public sector					
Years of employment in	N	Mean	S.D.		0 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 - 30 years	more than 30 years
Current municipality	83	10.3	9.2	Absolute	32	22	13	13	3
				Relative	38.6%	26.5%	15.7%	15.7%	3.6%
The public sector	83	16.5	10.1	Absolute	12	18	29	15	9
				Relative	14.5%	21.7%	34.9%	18.1%	10.8%

N = 83

The table shows the distribution of primary respondents according to years of employment in their current municipality and in the public sector in general.

Data is based on the following questions: "In how many years have you all in all been employed in the municipality where you are currently employed?" and "In how many years have you all in all been employed in the public sector?"

Regional distribution of municipalities in the dataset

Table 4 provides an overview of the distribution of municipalities in the dataset and all municipalities in Sweden according to national regions. For altogether 115 cases (municipalities) information was provided.

Regional representativeness is highest for Northern and Eastern Sweden with data for 44% of all municipalities in the region and lowest in Southern Sweden with data for 35% of all municipalities in the region. Altogether 40% or 115 out of all 290 Swedish municipalities are included in the dataset.

Table 4.
Distribution of municipalities in the dataset according to national region

Distribution of municipalities in the dataset according to national region					
National region	Frequencies				Regional representativeness*
	All municipalities		Municipalities in dataset		
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative	
Northern Sweden	85	29.3%	36	31.3%	44%
Eastern Sweden	78	26.9%	34	29.6%	44%
Southern Sweden	127	43.8%	45	39.1%	35%
All	290	100%	115	100%	40%

N = 115

The table shows the distribution of municipalities in the dataset and all municipalities in Sweden according to national regions.

Data is based on the identification of each municipality according to their regional location in Sweden.

* 'Regional representativeness' indicate the number of municipalities in the dataset as percentage of all municipalities according to region.

Responsibilities of primary respondent's departments

Table 5 provides an overview of the distribution in the responsibilities of the respondent's department. For altogether 115 cases (municipalities) information on the responsibilities of the department was provided.

The three most widespread responsibilities for the departments of primary respondents are: Budget planning and responsibility (respectively 79.1% for parks and 80% for roads), monitoring of maintenance (72.2% and 80%) and operational planning (68.7% and 77.4%). The less widespread responsibility is planning, strategy and development (33% and 36.5%).

Table 5.
Distribution in the dataset of overall responsibilities of the respondents' departments

Responsibility	Parks		Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
Planning, strategy and development	38	33.0%	42	36.5%
Administration	36	31.3%	53	46.1%
Operational planning	79	68.7%	89	77.4%
Monitoring of maintenance	83	72.2%	92	80.0%
Provision of maintenance operations (provider function)	65	56.5%	79	68.7%
Budget planning and responsibility	91	79.1%	92	80.0%
No responsibilities	17	14.8%	10	8.7%
All municipalities	115	100%	115	100%

N = 115

The table shows the distribution in the dataset of the overall responsibilities of the respondent's department.

Data is based on replies to questions whether the respondent's department had responsibility for seven different tasks within park or road administration.

Characteristics of municipal size of municipalities in the dataset

Table 6 provides a comparison of mean municipal size in the dataset with the mean municipal size of all Swedish municipalities.

The average population of municipalities included in the dataset is 45,176. The average population of all Swedish municipalities is 33,552. Independent T-test shows statistical significant difference in population size between the municipalities who are represented in the dataset and the 175 municipalities who isn't.

Table 6.
Comparison of mean municipal size (population) in the dataset

SURVEY DATA AVAILABLE	N	Population 2014	
		Mean	S.D.
No	175	25,913	35,982
Yes	115	45,176	99,801
All	290	33,552	69,265

N = 290

Data is based on population size of Swedish municipalities in December 2014 (Source: Statistics Sweden (SCB)).

Independent T-test* shows statistical significant differences between means for cases with available survey data and cases with no available survey data, $t(133.668) = -1.987$, $p = .049$.

* *Equal variance not assumed (based on Levene's Test for equality of variance, $p < .05$).*

Table 7 provides a comparison of mean municipal size in the dataset with the mean municipal size of all Swedish municipalities when an outlier municipality is excluded from the analysis (population size above: 500,000 inhabitants). The average population of municipalities is 40,826 when the outlier is excluded. The average population of all Swedish municipalities is 31,796 with the outlier excluded. Independent T-test shows a statistical significant difference ($p = .048$) in population size between the municipalities who are represented in the dataset and the 175 municipalities who isn't even though an outlier is excluded. However, the p-value for Levene's Test for Equality of Variance is very close to .05 ($p = .053$). If equal variance isn't assumed, the statistical significance for the differences between the two groups are losing strength ($p = .090$).

Table 7.
Comparison of mean municipal size (population) in the dataset (outlier excluded).

	N	Population 2014	
		Mean	S.D.
No	175	25,913	35,982
Yes	114	40,826	88,614
All	289	31,796	62,582

N = 289

Data is based on population size of Swedish municipalities in December 2014 (Source: Statistics Sweden (SCB)).

Independent T-test* shows statistical significant differences between means for cases with available survey data and cases with no available survey data, $t(287) = -1.990$, $p = .048$ even though an outlier (population size above 500,000 inhabitant) is excluded from the analysis.

Table 8 provides a comparison of mean municipal size in the dataset with the mean municipal size of all Swedish municipalities when Swedish municipalities with a population smaller than 8,000 and greater than 500,000 are excluded from the analysis.

The average population of municipalities included in the dataset is 36,747. The average population of all Swedish municipalities with populations larger than 8,000 and smaller than 500,000 is 33,387. Independent T-test shows no statistical significant differences ($p = .230$) in population size between the municipalities who are represented in the dataset and the 140 municipalities who isn't.

Table 8.
Comparison of mean municipal size (population) in the dataset for municipalities > 8,000 and < 500,000

SURVEY DATA AVAILABLE	N	Population 2014	
		Mean	S.D.
No	140	30,988	38,607
Yes	100	36,747	33,365
All	240	33,387	36,552

N = 240

Data is based on population size of Swedish municipalities in December 2014 (Source: Statistics Sweden (SCB)).

Independent T-test* shows no statistical significant differences between means for cases with available survey data and cases with no available survey data, $t(238) = -1.205$, $p = .230$ when municipalities smaller than 8,000 and greater than 500,000 are excluded from the analysis, i.e. similar p-value for bivariate correlation = .210.

SERVICE PROVISION: PROVIDERS, PURPOSE AND SUPPORT

Summary

This section provides data and statistics on who provides maintenance services, the purpose of using different services providers as well as the internal backing for the use of different types of services providers.

58.8% of all Swedish municipalities use a mix of private contractors and in-house providers for park and/or road maintenance services. The percentage of municipalities that only or partial use private contractors is higher for road maintenance services (72.2%) than for park maintenance services (46.1%). The percentage of municipalities that only use in-house providers is higher for park maintenance services (36.5%) than for road maintenance services (14.8%). A mix of private contractors and in-house providers is the most frequent arrangement for provision of road maintenance (55.7%) among Swedish municipalities whereas 31.3% among Swedish municipalities use a mix of private contractors and in-house providers for provision of park maintenance. Only few municipalities use other types of provision for park and/or road maintenance (14.8%).

The (un-weighted) average allocation of maintenance budget for private contractors is 28.3% for park services and 48.9% for road services. The variation in the allocation of maintenance budgets between private contractors and in-house provision is considerable for both park services (S.D. = 35.1%) and road services (S.D. = 33.4%). The respondents' evaluation of the optimal allocation of budgets between private contractors and in-house provision indicate that private contractors' share of budgets should increase for park maintenance services while the optimal share is approximately at level of the actual share for road maintenance services.

The highest ranked purposes for using private contractors is 'cost effective maintenance' and 'provide work the municipality cannot do' while the highest ranked purposes for using in-house provision is 'to ensure flexible maintenance', 'high quality maintenance' and 'to ensure capacity to carry out maintenance work'. In general, various purposes for using in-house provision are scored higher than for using private contractors.

The political support for contracting out (mean score = 6.4) is found to be scored slightly higher than the administrative support for contracting out (mean score = 5.6). The degree of continued debates about the use of contracting out is also scored slightly higher for the political level (mean score = 3.8) compared to the administrative level (mean score = 3.3).

The political support for using in-house provision (mean score = 6.5) is found to be scored slightly lower than the administrative support (mean score = 7.1). The degree of continued debates about the use of in-house provision is scored higher for the political level (mean score = 3.7) compared to the administrative level (mean score = 3.2). Statistical tests show that the only significant difference between support and continued debates for respectively contracting out and in-house provision is a higher administrative support for the use of in-house provision.

The use of different of types of service providers

Table 9 provides an overview of Swedish municipalities' use of different provider types for provision of park and road maintenance services. 58.3% of the municipalities use both private contractors and in-house providers for park and/or road maintenance services

The percentage of municipalities that only or partial use private contractors is higher for road maintenance services (72.2%) compared to park maintenance services (46.1%). The percentage of municipalities that only use in-house providers is higher for park maintenance services (36.5%) than for road maintenance services (14.8%). A mix of private contractors and in-house providers is the most frequent arrangement for provision of road maintenance (55.7%) among Swedish municipalities whereas 31.3% among Swedish municipalities use a mix of private contractors and in-house providers for provision of park maintenance. Use of other types of provision for park and/or road maintenance is less widespread among municipalities in the dataset.

Table 9.
The use of different provider types for provision of parks and road maintenance services

Type of provider	Park maintenance N = 98	Road maintenance N = 105	Park and/or Road maintenance N = 115
Use private contractors (only or partly)	54.1 % (53)	79.1 % (83)	75.7 % (87)
<i>Only use private contractors</i>	12.3 % (12)	16.2 % (17)	11.3 % (13)
<i>Partly use private contractors</i>	41.8% (41)	62.9 % (66)	64.3 % (74)
Use in-house provider (only or partly)	79.6 % (78)	78.1 % (82)	80 % (92)
<i>Only use in-house provider</i>	42.9 % (42)	16.2 % (17)	20 % (23)
<i>Partly use in-house provider</i>	36.7% (36)	61.9 % (65)	60 % (69)
Other type of provision*	15.3 % (15)	11.2 % (11)	14.8 % (17)
<i>Only use other type of provision</i>	10.2 % (10)	1.9 % (2)	1.7 % (2)
<i>Partly use other type of provision</i>	5.1 % (5)	8.6 % (9)	13 % (15)

N = 115

Data is based on categorical questions (yes/no/don't know) whether the municipality used different types of providers for park and/or road maintenance services.

* 'Other type of provision' include: 'co-owned municipal company/provider', 'other public authority', 'public-private company' as well as 'other type of provider organization'.

Distribution (un-weighted) of parks and roads maintenance budgets between provider types

Table 10 provides an overview of the current distribution of parks and roads maintenance budgets between different types of service providers.

The (un-weighted) average allocation of maintenance budget for private contractors is 28.3% for parks and 48.9% for roads. The variation in the allocation of maintenance budgets between private contractors and in-house provision is considerable for both park services and road services.

Table 10.
Current distribution (un-weighted) of parks and roads maintenance budgets between different types of service providers.

Statistics*	Parks			Roads		
	Private contractors	In-house provider	Other types of provider**	Private contractors	In-house provider	Other types of provider**
N	95	93	93	95	95	95
Mean	28.3 %	63.6 %	9.0 %	49.4 %	46,0 %	4.6 %
S.D.	35.1 %	39.0 %	7.9 %	33.3 %	33.4 %	6.0 %
Median	10.0 %	80.0 %	0 %	50.0 %	40.0 %	0 %
Low value	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
High Value	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

N= 95

The table reports the current distribution of maintenance budgets on different types of providers.

Data is based on self-reported estimates based on the size of budgets distributed for different arrangements.

** 'other type of provider includes: 'co-owned municipal provider', 'other public authority', 'co-owned public-private company' as well as 'other type of organization'.

Optimal distribution of maintenance budgets on different types of service providers

Table 11 provides an overview of primary respondents' opinion on the optimal allocation of maintenance budgets between different types of service providers.

In the case of park budgets for maintenance, the optimal allocation to private contractors is 34.1% on the average while 45% on the average for road maintenance budgets. Allocation to other type of service providers is the minimal on the average.

Table 11.
Optimal distribution of maintenance budgets on different types of service providers

		Provider type*					
		Private contractor	In-house	Shared municipal company/provider	Other public authority	Public-private company	Other type of provider organization
Parks	Mean	34.1%	57.5%	7.0%	0.2%	0.2%	1.9%
	S.D.	34.2%	35.7%	24.2%	1.2%	1.2%	12.3%
	Median	25.0%	70.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Low value	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	High value	100%	100%	100%	10%	10%	100%
Roads	Mean	45.0%	48.0%	6.1%	0.3%	1.0%	1.8%
	S.D.	32.7%	33.4%	17.9%	1.7%	6.3%	12.4%
	Median	47.5%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Low value	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	High value	100%	100%	100%	10%	50%	100%

N = 67

The table reports statistics on respondents' opinion about what the optimal distribution would be for maintenance budgets on different types of providers.

Paired t-tests between the data underlying Table 10 and Table 11 show that the difference in means between current and optimal distribution of park maintenance budgets for in-house providers is significant at p-level = .05, where $t(64) = 2.312$, $p = .024$. Statistics for the difference in means between current and optimal distribution of park maintenance budgets for private contractors is statistically significant at p-level = .10, where $t(65) = -1.941$, $p = .057$. The same tests for current and optimal road maintenance budgets for respectively private contractors and in-house providers show no statistical significant differences.

Purposes for using private contractors and in-house providers

Table 12 provides an overview on the importance of altogether seven different purposes for using private contractors for provision of maintenance services for parks and roads. Purposes are measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The highest ranked purposes are *cost effective maintenance* (mean = 7.4) and *provide work the municipality cannot do* (mean = 6.9) while *development of internal organization and work routines* (mean = 4.0) and *development and renewal of areas and services* (mean = 4.4) are the lowest ranked. In general, there is high variation among the municipalities in the importance of the various purposes for using private contractors. The variation is smallest for *cost effective maintenance* (S.D. = 2.1) and highest for *provide work the municipality cannot do* (S.D. = 3.0).

Table 12.
Purposes for using private contractors (parks and roads)

Purpose*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Cost effective maintenance</i>	65	7.4	2.1
<i>Provide work the municipality cannot do</i>	64	6.9	3.0
<i>Test and benchmark prices</i>	64	6.2	2.7
<i>Effective management of maintenance</i>	63	5.9	2.5
<i>High maintenance quality</i>	65	5.6	2.9
<i>Develop and renew areas and services</i>	65	4.4	2.7
<i>Develop internal organization and work routines</i>	65	4.0	2.7

N = 65

The table reports about the purposes for using private contractors in both departments of parks and roads.

Data is based on responses on the degree the respondent finds various purposes a key part of the municipality's rationale for using private contractors for parks and road maintenance services.

All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).

Table 13 provides an overview of the importance of altogether 11 different purposes for using in-house provision for maintenance of parks and roads. Purposes are measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The highest ranked purposes are *to ensure flexible maintenance* (mean = 8.3), *ensure capacity to carry out maintenance work* (mean = 8.0) and *ensure high maintenance quality* (mean = 8.0) while *to ensure test and benchmark prices* is the lowest ranked (mean = 5.9). The variation in the importance of the various purposes for using in-house provision differs to some degree between the various purposes. The variation between the municipalities is smallest for *to ensure flexible maintenance* and *high maintenance quality* (S.D. = 1.8) and highest for *to ensure democratic control* (S.D. = 3.0).

Table 13.
Purposes for using in-house provision (parks and roads)

Purpose*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>To ensure flexible maintenance</i>	69	8.3	1.8
<i>High maintenance quality</i>	68	8.0	1.8
<i>Ensure capacity to carry out maintenance work</i>	65	8.0	1.9
<i>Ensure good job conditions</i>	67	7.6	2.1
<i>Effective management of maintenance</i>	67	7.5	1.9
<i>Cost effective maintenance</i>	68	7.2	2.1
<i>Develop internal organization and work routines</i>	67	7.0	2.6
<i>Provide work only the municipality can provide</i>	63	6.6	2.8
<i>Develop and renew areas and services</i>	66	6.6	2.6
<i>To ensure democratic control</i>	63	6.6	3.0
<i>Test and benchmark prices</i>	62	5.9	2.6

N = 69

The table reports about the purposes for using in-house provision in case of both parks and roads.

Data is based on responses on the degree the respondent finds various purposes a key part of the municipality's rationale for using in-house provision for parks and road maintenance services.

All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'Very high degree').

Table 14 provides a comparison of purposes for using in-house provision and private contractors. Purposes are measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

One sample t-tests show that there is a statistical significant difference for four out of seven purposes for using in-house provision and private contractors. Using in-house providers compared to private contractors scores significantly higher for the purposes of *high maintenance quality*, *effective maintenance* and *development and renewal of areas and services* and *development of internal organization and work routines*. In cases of *cost effectiveness*, *test and benchmark prices* and *providing work others or the municipality cannot do*, there are no significant differences to be found between the purposes of using private contractors and in-house provision.

Table 14.
Comparison of purposes for using in-house provision and private contractors

Purpose	Means		Significance levels for differences **
	Private contractors (external)	In-house provider (internal)	
High maintenance quality	5.6	8.0	High t(67) = 11.065, p = .000
Cost effective maintenance	7.4	7.2	No t(67) = -.707, p = .482
Effective management of maintenance	5.9	7.5	High t(66) = 7.232, p = .000
Test and benchmark prices	6.2	5.9	No t(61) = -1.034, p = .305
Provide work the municipality/others cannot do	6.9	6.6	No t(62) = -.936, p = .353
Develop and renew areas and services	4.4	6.6	High t(65) = 6.895, p = .000
Develop internal organization and work routines	4.0	7.0	High t(66) = 9.452, p = .000

N = 68 (cases with in-house provision)

The table provides a comparison of purposes for using in-house provision and private contractors.

* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).

** Mean differences evaluated with one sample T-tests at significance levels < .1 (low), < .05 (moderate), < .01 (High).

Table 15 provides an overview of the evaluation of purposes for using in-house provision by different types of respondents. Purposes are measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree'.

The municipalities are split up into one group, one with direct responsibilities (49 municipalities) for park and/or road maintenance operations and one group with no direct responsibilities for parks and/or roads maintenance operations (20 municipalities). There does not seem to be an unambiguous connection between whether respondents have direct responsibilities for provision of park and/or road maintenance operations and their scoring. Independent samples t-tests show no statistically significant differences between the two groups on either of the performance dimensions.

Table 15.
Evaluation of purpose of using in-house provision by different types of respondents

	Performance dimension*							
	High maintenance quality	Cost effective maintenance	Effective management of maintenance	Flexible maintenance	Test and benchmark prices	Provide work others cannot do	Develop and renew areas and services	Develop internal organization and work routines
Respondents with direct responsibilities for provision of park and/or road maintenance operations (N= 49)								
N	48	48	47	49	44	44	47	48
Mean	7.9	7.1	7.7	8.3	5.9	6.8	6.7	7.2
S.D.	1.9	2.3	1.8	1.8	2.3	2.8	2.8	2.6
Respondents with no direct responsibilities for provision of park and/or road maintenance operations (N=20)								
N	20	20	20	20	18	19	19	19
Mean	8.4	7.6	7.3	8.5	6.0	6.2	6.6	6.7
S.D.	1.4	1.5	1.9	1.7	2.3	2.8	2.4	2.7
Significance levels for differences**								
Evaluation	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
		t(53.450) =						
Test statistics	t(66) = 1.142, p = .257	1.141, p = .259***	t(65) = -.826, p = .412	t(67) = .385, p = .701	t(60) = .214, p = .831	t(61) = -.772, p = .443	t(64) = -.112, p = .911	t(65) = -.702, p = .485

Total N=69

* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'Very high degree').

** Mean differences evaluated with independent samples T-tests at significance levels < .1(low), < .05 (moderate) and < .01 (high).

*** Equal variance not assumed (based on Levene's Test for equality of variance, $p < .05$).

Political and administrative support

Table 16 provides an overview of degree of political and administrative support for contracting out and debates about contracting out in the municipalities. The degree of debate and support is measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The average score for political aim to contract out (6.4) is slightly higher than the average score for the administrative aim to contract out (5.6). The degree of continued debates about contracting out is scored slightly higher for the political level (3.8) compared to the administrative level (3.3).

Table 16.
Political and administrative support for contracting out

Dimension	N	Mean	S.D
Political aim to contracting out	63	6.4	2.8
Administrative aim to contracting out	63	5.6	2.8
Continued political debates about contracting out	63	3.8	3.2
Continued administrative debates about contracting out	65	3.3	2.7

N = 65

The table reports about the political and administrative support for contracting out.

All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).

Table 17 provides an overview of degree of political and administrative support for in-house provision and debates about in-house provision in the municipalities. The degree of debate and support is measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The average score for political aim to use in-house provision (6.5) is slightly lower than the average score for the administrative aim to use in-house provision (7.1). The degree of continued debates about the use of in-house provision is scored higher for the political level (3.7) compared to the administrative level (3.2).

Table 17.
Political and administrative support for in-house provision

Dimension	N	Mean	S.D
Administrative aim in the municipality	63	7.1	2.7
Political aim in the municipality	61	6.5	2.8
Continued political debates in the municipality	61	3.7	2.8
Continued administrative debates in the municipality	62	3.2	2.6

N = 63

The table reports about the political and administrative support for in-house provision.

All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).

Table 18 provides a comparison of the political and administrative debate and support for in-house and private provision. The degree of debate and support is measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The table provides information about the differences between the support for in-house and private provision. The only difference that is evaluated as statistically significant is the differences in the administrative aim in the municipality for using either private contractors compared to using in-house provision. The degree in which it is an administrative aim to use in-house provision is relatively higher than the degree in which it is an administrative aim to use private contractors.

Table 18.
Comparison of political and administrative debate and support for in-house and private provision

Dimension of support	Means			Significance levels for differences **
	In-house provider (internal)	Private contractors (external)	Difference	
Political aim in the municipality	6.5	6.4	.1	No t(60) = .303, p = .763
Administrative aim in the municipality	7.1	5.6	1.5	High t(62) = 4.418, p = .000
Continued political debates in the municipality	3.7	3.8	.1	No t(60) = -.314, p = .755
Continued administrative debates in the municipality	3.2	3.3	.1	No t(61) = -.175, p = .861

The table reports about the comparison of political and administrative debate and support for in-house and private provision.

* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).

** Mean differences evaluated with one sample T-tests at significance levels < .1 (low), < .05 (moderate), < .01 (High).

MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

Summary

This section provides data and statistics on the management and organization of the provision of park and road maintenance services.

The average size of maintenance budgets is found to be around 12.6 mill. SEK/year for parks departments and 28.8 mill. SEK/year for road departments. The average maintenance budget at the department level per inhabitant in the municipality is 320 SEK/year for parks and 750 SEK/year for roads. The average maintenance budget at the department level for both parks and roads is 1070 SEK/year.

Measured on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree), the most important features of formal contract relations between park and road departments in Swedish municipalities and private contractors are '*juridical clauses / agreements*' (mean score = 7.8) and '*competence requirements*' (mean score = 7.1). The two least important features are: '*contractor's involvement / contact with users*' (mean score = 3.0) and '*economic incentives for investment, improvements and optimization*' (mean score = 2.1).

Measured on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree), the most important features in the management approach toward private contractors are '*focus on compliance to formal operational specifications*' (mean score = 8.2) and '*focus on strategic and long-term aims*' (mean score = 7.2). '*Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance*' is a less important feature in the management approach (mean score = 4.3).

The mutual institutionalization of behavioural norms in relations between municipalities and private contractors providing park and road maintenance services (measured on a scale from 0 = 'not at all' to 10 = 'very high degree') is strongest for norms related to the necessity of '*collaboration*' (mean score = 7.8) and '*flexibility*' toward change (mean score = 7.1). The institutionalization is weakest for norms related to '*trust*' (mean score = 5.2). While the institutionalization of norms for collaboration and flexibility varies in a minor degrees (respectively, S.D. = 1.9) between the municipalities the norms related to trust varies greatly (S.D. = 3.0).

In the formal organisation of management of in-house providers the most two most frequently used instruments are: '*separate top management*' (85.3% of all municipalities) and '*separate budgeting / financial statements*' (82.7% of all municipalities). '*Business plans*' is also commonly used (73.6% of all municipalities). The two least frequently used instruments

are '*formal provider-purchaser split*' (41.7% of all municipalities) and '*a company ownership structure*' (11% of all municipalities).

The degree of separation of in-house provision, i.e. internally organized maintenance operations, from other responsibilities within park and road services (measured on a scale from 0 = 'not at all' to 10 = 'very high degree') is highest for responsibilities regarding '*general planning, strategy and development*' (mean scores = 5.8 for parks and 5.9 for roads) and '*administration and authority / legal tasks*' (mean score = 5.4 for parks and 6.2 for roads). The degree of separation is lowest for '*monitoring of maintenance*' (mean scores = 4.1 for parks and 4.6 for roads). In general, the degree of separation of in-house provision varies immensely between the municipalities for both park and road services.

Measured on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree), the most important features in the management approach toward in-house providers are '*use of face-to-face meetings and communications*' (mean score = 7.9) as well as '*fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims*' (mean score = 9.3). '*Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance*' is a less important feature in the management approach (mean score = 2.2). The difference in the importance of '*Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance*' in the management approaches toward private contractors and in-house providers is statistically significant.

The mutual institutionalization of behavioural norms in relations within the municipality toward the department with responsibility for in-house provision of park and road maintenance services (measured on a scale from 0 = 'not at all' to 10 = 'very high degree') is strongest for norms related to the necessity of '*collaboration*' (mean score = 7.9) and '*solidarity*' (mean score = 7.5). The institutionalization is relatively weakest for norms related to '*trust*' (mean score = 6.6) and '*lack of opportunism*' (mean score = 6.9). While the institutionalization of norms for collaboration and solidarity varies to in lesser degrees (respectively, S.D. = 2.0 and 2.1) between the municipalities the norms related to solidarity and lack of opportunism varies greatly (respectively, S.D. = 2.5 and 3.1).

Park maintenance services provided by in-house are found to be significantly more '*difficult to monitor*' (34.7 % of all services) and less '*easy to describe clearly and unambiguously*' (64.6% of all services) compared to services provided by private contractors (respectively 26.9% and 72.7% of all services). Road maintenance services provided by in-house are found to be significantly more '*difficult to monitor*' (41.8% of all services) and '*difficult to provide without joint planning and communication*' (53.3% of all services) compared to services provided by private contractors (respectively 31.2% and 44%).

Formal management of private providers

Table 19 provides an overview of the importance of eight possible formal contract dimensions for managing and organizing provision of park and road maintenance services by private contractors. All dimensions is measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The two highest scored formal dimensions are *juridical clauses / agreement* and *competence requirements*. The two lowest scored formal dimensions are: *contractor’s involvement / contact with users* and *economic incentives for investment, improvements and optimization*.

Table 19.
Formal contract dimensions for managing and organizing provision of park and road maintenance services by private contractors

Importance of formal dimension*	Descriptive statistics		
	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Juridical clauses / agreement (§§)</i>	81	7.8	2.8
<i>Competence requirements</i>	80	7.1	2.6
<i>Service specification based on quantities and instruction and performance measures</i>	79	6.7	2.9
<i>Service specification based on functionality and purpose</i>	77	6.1	3.1
<i>Formal sanctions in case of non-compliance</i>	77	5.7	3.1
<i>Formal collaboration and joint planning</i>	80	4.3	3.2
<i>Contractor’s involvement / contact with users</i>	78	3.0	2.9
<i>Economic incentives for investment, improvements and optimization</i>	74	2.1	2.8

N = 81

The table reports about the contract dimensions for managing and organizing provision of park and road maintenance services by private contractors.

* All items measured on a scale from 0 to 10 (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree) on the question. “On a scale from 0 to 10, please indicate in which degree the following content is a central part of your department’s arrangements with private contractors”.

Formal management of in-house providers

Table 20 provides an overview of Swedish municipalities' use of eight possible formal instruments for managing and organizing in-house providers of road and park maintenance services.

The two most widespread instruments are: *separate top management* (85.3 % of all municipalities) and *separate budgeting / financial statements* (82.7 %). The two least frequently used instruments are: *formal provider-purchaser split* (41.7%) and *a company ownership structure* (11%).

Table 20.
Formal instruments for managing and organizing in-house providers

Formal instruments (municipal parks and roads service providers)*	Frequencies (relative / absolute)**					
	Yes		No		Don't know / no answer	
Separate top management	85.3 %	64	10.7 %	8	4.0 %	3
Separate budgeting / financial statement	82.7 %	62	14.7 %	11	2.7 %	2
Business plans	73.6 %	53	16.7 %	12	9.7 %	7
Allowed to carry out tasks for other clients	58.3 %	42	26.4 %	19	15.3 %	11
Separate monitoring function of maintenance operations	58.9 %	43	37 %	27	4.1 %	3
Competitive tendering of in-house tasks	46.8 %	36	39.0 %	30	14.3 %	11
Formal Purchaser-Provider split	41.7 %	30	54.2 %	39	4.2 %	3
Company ownership structure (100% owned by municipality)	11 %	8	80.8 %	59	8.2 %	6

N = 75

* The table provides an overview of the distribution of answers ('yes', 'no' and 'don't know') for eight key management instruments on the question: "Which of the following management instruments does the municipality use for managing and organizing the in-house service provision of parks and roads maintenance?"

** The relative frequencies count the share of the group of municipalities with in-house providers that use a particular management instrument.

Size of park and road maintenance budgets

Table 21 provides an overview of the average size of total budgets (in mill. SEK) for maintenance of parks and roads at the department level and at the level of municipalities.

The average size of maintenance budgets for parks departments is indicated to be around 12.6 mill. SEK/year and 28.8 mill. SEK/year for road departments. On the average, the budgets at the department level for road maintenance are more than double as high as the average budget for park maintenance.

Table 21.
Size of park and road maintenance budgets (mill. SEK)

	Parks - Maintenance budgets		Roads - Maintenance budgets	
	Department*	Municipality**	Department*	Municipality**
N	84	39	88	40
Mean	12.6	26.5	28.8	42.1
S.D.	21.1	57.7	34.4	80.3

The table shows the average size of total maintenance budgets for parks and roads at the level of departments and the municipality as a whole.

* Department refers to the department's maintenance budgets for parks or roads where the respondent is employed.

**Municipality refers to the municipality's overall maintenance budgets for parks and roads.

Table 22 provides an overview of the average size of budgets per inhabitant (SEK) for maintenance of parks and roads at the department level.

The average maintenance budget at the department level per inhabitant in the municipality is 320 SEK/year for parks and 750 SEK/year for roads. The average maintenance budget at the department level for both parks and roads is 1070 SEK/year.

Table 22.
Size of park and road maintenance budgets per inhabitant (SEK).

	Parks	Roads
	Department*	Department*
N	84	88
Mean (SEK)	320	750
S.D. (SEK)	534	895
Min. (SEK)	13	1.3
Max. (SEK)	4406	3901

The table shows the average size of maintenance budgets per inhabitant for parks and roads at the level of departments.

* Department refers to the department's maintenance budgets for parks or roads where the respondent is employed.

Management approach and relations to providers

Table 23 shows the average degree in which four important management instruments characterize Swedish municipalities' management of private contractors providing park and road maintenance services. Characteristics are measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

The most important features in the management approach toward private contractors are '*compliance to formal operational specifications*' (mean score = 8.2) as well as '*fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims*' (mean score = 7.2) and '*use of face-to-face meetings and communications*' (mean score = 7.0). '*Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance*' is a less important feature in the management approach (mean score = 4.3).

Table 23.
Management of private contractors.

Management dimension	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance</i>	74	4.3	2.5
<i>Focus on compliance to formal operational specifications</i>	74	8.2	1.9
<i>Use of face-to-face meetings / communications</i>	75	7.0	2.5
<i>Focus on strategic and long-term aims</i>	74	7.2	2.1

N = 75

The table shows the degree in which various management instruments characterize Swedish municipalities' management of private contractors providing park and road maintenance.

* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree') for four questions regarding the degree various management instruments characterize the municipality's management of private contractors providing park and road maintenance.

Comparison of the management of private contractors and in-house providers

Table 24 shows the average degree in which four important management instruments characterize Swedish municipalities' management of the in-house provision of park and road maintenance services. Characteristics are measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

The most important features in the management approach toward in-house providers are '*fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims*' (mean score = 9.3) as well as '*use of face-to-face meetings and communications*' (mean score = 7.9) and '*compliance to formal operational specifications*' (mean score = 7.6). '*Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance*' is a less important feature in the management approach (mean score = 2.2).

Table 24.
Management of in-house provider.

Management dimension	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance</i>	67	2.2	2.7
<i>Focus on compliance to formal operational specifications</i>	63	7.6	2.3
<i>Use of face-to-face meetings / communications</i>	68	7.9	1.9
<i>Focus on fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims</i>	91	9.3	3.2

N = 91

The table shows the degree in which various management instruments characterize Swedish municipalities' management of in-house provision of park and road maintenance.

* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree') for four questions regarding the degree various management instruments characterize the municipality's management of in-house provision of park and road maintenance.

Table 25 presents a comparison of characteristics of the management of private contractors and in-house provision of park and road maintenance. Characteristics are measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

Statistical analysis by one sample t-tests shows that all management dimensions differ significantly between the management of private contractors and in-house provision of park and road maintenance. The statistical analysis shows that the management of private contractors in a significant degree is characterized by a higher degree of *adherence to hard sanctions for noncompliance* and *focus on compliance to formal operational specifications* whereas the management of in-house providers is characterized by a higher degree of *use of face-to-face meetings / communications* and *focus on fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims*.

Table 25.
Comparison of the management of private contractors and in-house providers.

Management dimensions	Means			Significance levels for differences **
	Private	In-house	Difference	
<i>Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance</i>	4.3	2.2	2.1	High t(66) = -6.401, p = .000
<i>Focus on compliance to formal operational specifications</i>	8.2	7.6	0.6	Moderate t(62) = -2.130, p = .037
<i>Use of face-to-face meetings / Communications</i>	7.0	7.9	0.9	High t(67) = 3.982, p = .000
<i>Focus on fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims</i>	7.2	9.3	2.1	High t(90) = 6.470, p = .000

The table shows a comparison of the management of private contractors and in-house provision of park and road maintenance.

* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree'.

** Mean differences evaluated with one sample T-tests at significance levels < .1 (low), < .05 (moderate), < .01 (High).

Table 26 shows the degree in which contract management capacity for managing private contractors is evaluated as sufficient. The degree of sufficiency is measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

The table shows that, on the average, '*knowledge and experience*', '*methods and systems*' and '*managerial routines and procedures*' are evaluated sufficient in relatively high degrees (mean scores between 6.2 and 6.9) while '*organisational resources*' is evaluated as less sufficient by a relatively lower score (4.6).

Table 26.
Contract management capacity for managing private contractors.

Dimension of capacity*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Sufficient knowledge and experience</i>	68	6.9	2.0
<i>Sufficient methods and systems (GIS and ICT)</i>	67	6.6	2.5
<i>Sufficient managerial routines and procedures</i>	67	6.2	2.3
<i>Sufficient organizational resources (time and staff)</i>	68	4.6	2.8

N = 68

The table shows average scores for the evaluation of the degree in which the contract management capacity for managing private contractors is sufficient.

* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'Very high degree')..

Organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance

Table 27 shows the degrees in which the in-house service provision of park and road maintenance at the operational level are organizationally and managerially separated from other responsibilities related to park and road services. The degree of separation is measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

For parks, the separation is most profound for tasks related to ‘*general planning, strategy and development*’ whereas the separation is most profound for tasks related to ‘*administration and authority / legal tasks*’ for roads. The separation is less profound for tasks related to ‘*general maintenance planning*’, ‘*monitoring of maintenance*’ as well as ‘*planning and administration of budgets*’ for both parks and roads. The variations among municipalities in the separation measured by standard deviations are very high for all types of responsibilities (S.D. ranging from 3.3 to 4.1).

Table 27.
The degree of organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance

Degree of separation of in-house provision of maintenance from ... *	Parks			Roads		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>General planning, strategy and development</i>	55	5.8	3.6	54	5.9	3.6
<i>Administration and authority / legal tasks</i>	53	5.4	3.7	55	6.2	3.3
<i>General maintenance planning**</i>	55	4.4	3.9	57	4.7	3.7
<i>Monitoring of maintenance (besides self-monitoring)</i>	55	4.1	3.9	56	4.6	3.5
<i>General planning and administration of budgets</i>	54	4.2	4.1	57	5.2	3.9

N = 55 (Parks), N = 57 (Roads).

The table shows the degree of organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance from other responsibilities related to park and road services.

* All items measured on a scale from 0 to 10 (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

** General maintenance planning includes: area registration, quality descriptions / service standards, maintenance plans, purchaser function).

Transactional characteristics of park and road maintenance services

Table 28 shows the evaluation of general transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided by private contractors.

72.7% of park maintenance services and approximately two-thirds of road maintenance services provided by private contractors are evaluated as '*easy to describe clearly and unambiguously*'. 38.8% of park maintenance services and 44% of road maintenance services are evaluated as '*difficult to provide without joint planning and communication*'. 26.9% of park maintenance and 31.1% of road maintenance is evaluated as '*difficult to monitor*'.

Table 28.
General transactional characteristics of services provided by private contractors

The percentage of services that are:	Parks			Roads		
	Difficult to monitor	Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication	Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously	Difficult to monitor	Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication	Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously
N	35	33	34	58	58	58
Mean	26.9%	38.8%	72.7%	31.2%	44%	66.6%
S.D.	20%	26.7%	17.5%	21.7%	27.1%	21.8%

N = 35 (Parks) N = 58 (Roads)

The table shows the general transactional characteristics of park and road maintenance services provided by private contractors.

** The table reports the percentage of services (provided by private contractors) which are difficult to monitor, difficult to provide without joint planning and communication, and easy to describe clearly and unambiguously.*

Table 29 shows the evaluation of general transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided in-house.

64.6% of park maintenance and 67.1% of road maintenance provided in-house are evaluated as '*easy to describe clearly and unambiguously*'. 44.8% of park maintenance and 53.3% of road maintenance are evaluated as '*difficult to provide without joint planning and communication*'. 34.7% of park maintenance and 41.8% of road maintenance are evaluated as '*difficult to monitor*'.

Table 29.
General transactional characteristics of services provided in-house

The percentage of services that are*:	Parks			Roads		
	Difficult to monitor	Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication	Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously	Difficult to monitor	Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication	Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously
N	53	52	52	49	48	48
Mean	34.7%	44.8%	64.6%	41.8%	53.3%	67.1%
S.D.	25.8%	27.2%	23.6%	28.3%	27.3%	21.1%

N = 53 (Parks) N = 49 (Roads)

The table shows the general transactional characteristics of park and road maintenance services provided in-house.

* The table reports the percentage of services (provided in-house) that are difficult to monitor, difficult to provide without joint planning and communication, and easy to describe clearly and unambiguously.

Table 30 presents a comparison between transactional characteristics for park maintenance services provided in-house and by private contractors.

Statistical analysis by one sample t-tests shows the difficulties with monitoring service provisions and easiness of describing services differs in significant degrees between private contractors and in-house provision. The statistical analysis shows that evaluation of difficulties of providing park maintenance services without joint planning and communication do not differ in a significant degree between private contractors and in-house provision. The analysis shows that it is less difficult to monitor services provided by private contracts, and it is easier to describe clearly and unambiguously park maintenance services that are provided by private contractors. On average, a high proportion (44.8%) of services provided by in-house providers is reported to be difficult to provide without joint planning and communication. However, the difference between private contractors and in-house provision for the difficulties to provide park maintenance without joint planning and communication is not statistically significant at even modest levels ($< .1$).

Table 30.
Comparison of transactional characteristics of park maintenance services provided in-house and by private contractors

Transactional characteristics of park maintenance services*	Means			Significance levels for differences **
	In-house	Private	Difference	
<i>Difficult to monitor</i>	34.7%	26.9%	7.8%	Moderate t(52) = 2.202, p = .032
<i>Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication</i>	44.8%	38.8%	6.0%	None t(51) = 1.593, p = .117
<i>Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously</i>	64.6%	72.7%	8.1%	Moderate t(51) -2.467, p = .017

The table shows the comparison of transactional characteristics of park maintenance services provided in-house and by private contractors.

* The items is measured as the percentage of services (provided in-house) that are difficult to monitor, difficult to provide without joint planning and communication, and easy to describe clearly and unambiguously.

** Mean differences evaluated with one sample T-tests at significance levels $< .1$ (low), $< .05$ (moderate), $< .01$ (High).

Table 31 shows a comparison between transactional characteristics for road maintenance services provided in-house and by private contractors.

Statistical analysis by one sample t-tests shows the difficulties with monitoring service provisions and providing road maintenance services without joint planning and communication differs in significant degrees between private contractors and in-house provision. The statistical analysis shows that evaluation of easiness of describing services do not differ in a significant degree between private contractors and in-house provision. The analysis shows that it is less difficult to monitor services provided by private contracts and that provision of road maintenance services without joint planning and communication is easier when provided by private contractors. On average, a slightly higher proportion (67.1%) of services provided by in-house providers are reported to be difficult to describe clearly and unambiguously. However, the difference between private contractors and in-house provision for the difficulties regarding describing park maintenance clearly and unambiguously is not statistically significant at even modest levels ($< .1$).

Table 31.
Comparison of general transactional characteristics of road maintenance services provided in-house and by private contractors

Transactional characteristics of road maintenance services*	Means			Significance levels for differences **
	In-house	Private	Difference	
<i>Difficult to monitor</i>	41.8%	31.2%	10.6%	Moderate t(48) = 2.628, p = .012
<i>Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication</i>	53.3%	44%	9.3%	Moderate t(47) = 2.367, p = .022
<i>Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously</i>	67.1%	66.6%	0.5%	None t(47) = .158, p = .875

The table shows the comparison of general transactional of road maintenance services provided in-house and by private contractors.

* The items is measured as the percentage of services (provided in-house) that are difficult to monitor, difficult to provide without joint planning and communication, and easy to describe clearly and unambiguously.

** Mean differences evaluated with one sample T-tests at significance levels $< .1$ (low), $< .05$ (moderate), $< .01$ (High).

Mutual institutionalization of behavioural norms

Table 32 shows the mutual institutionalization of six behavioural norms in relations between municipalities and private contractors providing park and road maintenance services. The behavioural norms is operationalized by altogether six different items which measure the presence of norms in favour of ‘collaboration’, ‘mutuality’, ‘flexibility’, ‘lack of opportunism’, ‘trust’, and ‘solidarity’ in the relation. The degree of institutionalization is measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The evaluation shows that ‘*collaboration*’ (mean score = 7.8) and ‘*flexibility*’ (mean score = 7.1) characterise the relations with private contractor in relatively high degrees while ‘*trust*’ (mean score = 5.2) characterize the relations in a lower degree although the variation among municipalities for ‘*trust*’ is relatively high (S.D. = 3.0).

Table 32.
The degree of institutionalization of behavioural norms in relations with private contractors

Dimension of relational norms*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Need for collaboration</i>	77	7.8	1.9
<i>Mutuality</i>	75	7.0	2.3
<i>Flexibility</i>	77	7.1	1.9
<i>Lack of opportunism</i>	73	6.2	2.9
<i>Trust</i>	73	5.2	3.0
<i>Solidarity</i>	74	6.8	2.4

N = 77

The table shows the strength of external relational (collaborative) norms in relations with private contractors.

Data is based on responses to the degree whether the following survey items characterize the relation(s) with private contractors: “We both believe that collaboration is necessary for each of us can be successful”, “We are both concerned whether our partner achieves her aims”, “We are both ready to change circumstances for service provisions if it makes the work easier for one part”, “None of us would exploit a weakness or mistake by the other for own advantage”, “We both think it is alright to own one another a favour”, and “We both believe that problem-solving is a joint responsibility regardless who of us that has the blame”. See appendices for original Swedish versions of items.

* All items measured by a specific question on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’).

Table 33 shows the institutionalization of behavioural norms of relations within the municipality toward the department with responsibility for in-house provision of park and road maintenance services. The degree of institutionalization is measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree'. The relational quality is operationalized by altogether six different items. The relational quality is operationalized by altogether six different items which measure the presence of norms in favour of 'collaboration', 'mutuality', 'flexibility', 'lack of opportunism', 'trust', and 'solidarity' in the relation.

The evaluation shows that 'need for collaboration' (mean score = 7.9), 'solidarity' (mean score = 7.5), 'flexibility' (mean score = 7.4) and 'mutuality' (mean score = 7.3). Although relatively highly scored, 'trust' and 'lack of opportunism' get the lowest scores (mean scores 6.9) among the six items and have the highest variation among municipalities (S.D. = 2.5 and 3.1).

Table 33.
The degree of institutionalization of behavioural norms in the internal relations with an in-house provider

Dimension of relational norms*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Need for collaboration</i>	68	7.9	2.0
<i>Mutuality</i>	67	7.3	2.0
<i>Flexibility</i>	68	7.4	2.1
<i>(Lack of opportunism)</i>	66	6.9	3.1
<i>Trust</i>	60	6.6	2.5
<i>Solidarity</i>	66	7.5	2.1

N = 68

The table shows the strength of internal relational (collaborative) norms in relations with in-house providers.

Data is based on responses to following survey items: "We both believe that collaboration is necessary for each of us can be successful", "We are both concerned whether our partner achieves her aims", "We are both ready to change circumstances for service provisions if it makes the work easier for one part", "None of us would exploit a weakness or mistake by the other for own advantage", "We both think it is alright to own one another a favour", and "We both believe that problem-solving is a joint responsibility regardless who of us that has the blame". See appendices for original Swedish versions of items.

** All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree'.*

Table 34 compares the institutionalization of behavioural norms between internal (in-house) and external (private contractors) relations with providers of park and road maintenance services. The degree of institutionalization is measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

Statistical analysis by one sample t-test shows that for the items ‘trust’, ‘solidarity’ and ‘lack of opportunism’ the scores are significantly higher for internal relations compared to external relations. The analysis shows no statistically significant differences between internal and external relations regarding the scores for ‘need for collaboration’, ‘flexibility’ and ‘mutuality’. The comparison and statistical analysis in Table 34 shows that the overall relational quality of internal relations is relatively stronger than the relational quality for external relations in all six dimensions.

Table 34.
Comparison of the institutionalization of six behavioural norms in internal and external relations

Dimension of relational norms*	Means		Difference	Significance levels for differences **
	In-house provider (internal)	Private contractors (external)		
<i>Need for collaboration</i>	7.9	7.8	0.1	None t(67) = .280, p = .780
<i>Mutuality</i>	7.3	7.0	0.3	None t(66) = 1.307, p = .196
<i>Flexibility</i>	7.4	7.1	0.3	None t(67) = 1.230, p = .223
<i>Lack of opportunism</i>	6.9	6.2	0.6	Low t(65) = 1.760, p = .083
<i>Trust</i>	6.6	5.2	1.4	High t(59) = 4.293, p = .000
<i>Solidarity</i>	7.5	6.8	0.7	Moderate t(65) = 2.605, p = .011

N = 77

The table shows a comparison of the internal and the external relational (collaboration) norms.

Data is based on responses to following survey items: "We both believe that collaboration is necessary for each of us can be successful", "We are both concerned whether our partner achieves her aims", "We are both ready to change circumstances for service provisions if it makes the work easier for one part", "None of us would exploit a weakness or mistake by the other for own advantage", "We both think it is alright to own one another a favour", and "We both believe that problem-solving is a joint responsibility regardless who of us that has the blame". See appendices for original Swedish versions of items.

* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree'.

** Mean differences evaluated with one sample T-tests at significance levels < .1 (low), < .05 (moderate), < .01 (High).

Organizational changes and economic pressures

Table 35 shows the degree of experienced (past five years) and expected (next five years) internal organizational changes. The degree of internal organizational change is measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree'.

On average, the degree of both past (mean = 6.5) and future (mean = 6.8) change is evaluated relatively high. The variation among the municipalities in experienced and expected organizational change is relatively high (S.D. = 2.6 and 2.2).

Table 35.
Experienced and expected organizational change

Dimension	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Experienced changes in organization and responsibilities in past five years</i>	78	6.5	2.6
<i>Expected changes in organization and responsibilities in the next five years</i>	79	6.8	2.2

N = 79

The table shows the experienced and the expected organizational change.

* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree').

Table 36 shows the degree in which budget pressures have been experienced in the past five years and the degree budget pressures are expected for next five years. The degree of budget pressures are measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree'. On average, the degree of both past and future budget pressures is evaluated as high (means scores = 7.8 and 8.0).

Table 36.
Experienced and expected budget pressures

Dimension	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Experienced budget pressures in the past five years</i>	82	7.8	2.5
<i>Expected budget pressures in the next five years</i>	82	8.0	2.1

N = 82

The table shows the experienced and expected budget pressures.

* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree').

PROCUREMENT, MARKETS AND CONTRACTS

The use of public procurement and private contractors for provision of maintenance services is widespread among Swedish municipalities. The use is slightly more profound for road services than for park services.

More than 97% of all municipalities have procured road services one time or more within the past ten years while the similar figure is 93% for park services. In procurement processes, a majority of the municipalities don't use control bids or an internal control calculation.

On the average, municipalities evaluate the quality of their procurement materials as relatively good with only a small need for improvement. The degree of juridical/legal barriers is measured by three different items. '*Problems with finding the best possible private contractor*' attains the highest mean score (= 5.2) whereas '*Problems that has affected maintenance operations negatively*' attains the lowest mean score (= 3.5). The variation among municipalities in the degree of juridical/legal barriers/problems is relatively high (S.D. ranging from 3.3 to 3.0).

Procurement and markets

Table 37 shows the distribution of municipalities that in the past ten years procured road and park services and which currently use private contractors. The table shows that within the past ten years 84.9 % of the municipalities have procured park services and 83.1 % have procured road services. In the case of road services, 44.6 % have procured maintenance services four times or more, while the corresponding figure for park services is 39.6 %. In the case of parks services, 3.8 % haven't procured maintenance services, while in the case of road services only approximately 2.4 % haven't procured maintenance services.

Table 37.
Distributions of municipalities that in the past ten years procured road and parks services and which currently use private contractors

	Parks Absolute / relative distributions		Roads Absolute / relative distributions	
Procured one time or more in the past ten years	45	84.9 %	69	83.1 %
<i>One time</i>	4	7.5 %	2	2.4 %
<i>Two times</i>	10	18.9 %	12	14.5 %
<i>Three times</i>	10	18.9 %	18	21.7 %
<i>Four times or more</i>	21	39.6 %	37	44.6 %
Not procured services	2	3.8 %	2	2.4 %
No answer	6	11.3 %	14	16.9 %
N	53	100 %	83	100 %
Don't use private contractors	62		32	

N = 115

The table shows the distributions of municipalities that procure park and road maintenance services and which are currently using private contractors for provision of maintenance services.

Table 38 shows the use of internal control bid/calculation in procurements of parks and/or road maintenance by park and road departments in Swedish municipalities.

For those municipalities where respondents have indicated that they knew whether internal a control bid / calculation was used a majority indicates that it has not been used (78% or 50 out of 64 municipalities). A relatively low proportion of respondents indicated that they didn't know whether internal control bid / calculations were used or provided no answer (8.6% or 6 out of 70). 16 out of 115 municipalities did not provide any answer.

Table 38.
Use of internal control bid / calculation in procurements of parks and/or roads maintenance

	Frequencies	
	Absolute	Relative
Yes	14	20%
No	50	71.4%
Don't know	6	8.6%
No answer	0	0%
Total	70	100%
Use private contractor, but not procuring services	0	
Don't use private contractors (within parks and roads)	29	
Total	115	

N = 115

The table shows the distribution of municipalities which use internal control bids / calculation when they procure maintenance service for parks and/or roads.

Table 39 shows the evaluation of the quality of Swedish municipalities' procurement and contract documents as well as their service specifications.

The majority of the municipalities evaluate their procurement and contract documents as well as their services specifications as '*good, but can be improved*' (respectively 55.8% and 60.8%). A good share of the municipalities also evaluate their procurement and contract documents as well as their services specifications as '*excellent and need only minor adjustments*' (respectively 25.7% and 21.6%). Only few municipalities evaluate their procurement and contract documents as well as their services specifications as either '*should be improved significantly*' or '*is very poor and should be thoroughly revised*'.

Table 39.
Evaluation of the municipality's procurement and contract documents and service specifications

Evaluation (Roads and Parks)	Quality of			
	Procurement and contract documents		Service specifications	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
Is very poor and should be thoroughly revised	1	1.4%	0	0%
Should be significantly improved	11	14.9%	10	13.5%
Is good, but can be improved	41	55.4%	45	60.8%
Is excellent and needs only minor adjustments	19	25.7%	16	21.6%
Don't know	2	2.7%	3	4.1%
Total (N)	74	100%	74	100%

N = 74

The table shows the distributions of municipalities that evaluate the quality of procurement and contract documents and service specifications for roads and parks maintenance services according to four ordinal scaled categories.

Table 40 shows the degree of use of various types of analysis and information in planning of procurement of park and road maintenance services. The degree of use are evaluated by an 11-point response-scale with anchors where 0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree'.

All types of analysis are used fairly well. The use of analysis of '*legal and procurement options*' and analysis of '*own experiences*' are the most dominant ways of analysis in procurement planning (mean scores between 7.0 and 7.8) while the use of '*analysis from external consultants*' is the least prominent ways (mean = 4.3).

Table 40.
Use of analysis in procurement planning

Use of ...*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Analysis of own experiences</i>	69	7.8	1.3
<i>Analysis of legal and procurement options</i>	62	7.0	2.5
<i>Analysis of other municipalities' experiences</i>	69	6.0	2.4
<i>Analysis of markets**</i>	67	5.6	2.1
<i>Advice from external consultants</i>	69	4.3	2.8

N = 69

The table shows the degree for municipalities' use of various analyses when they procure services for maintenance of parks and/or roads.

* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'Very high degree').

** Paired T-tests shows that the use of 'analysis of own experiences' is highly statistically significant (at p-level < .01) from the use of 'analysis of legal and procurement options', $t(61) = 3.780$, $p = .000$, 'analysis of other municipalities experiences', $t(68) = 6.148$, $p = .000$, 'analysis of markets', $t(66) = 8.806$, $p = .000$, and 'advice from external consultants', $t(68) = 9.790$, $p = .000$.

Table 41 shows the municipalities' evaluation of three key transactional dimensions of market relations. The dimensions are evaluated by an 11-point response-scale with anchors where 0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree'.

The average degree of market competition is evaluated as relatively high (mean = 6.8). The degree of expected disturbance from sudden failure from contractor has the lowest mean score (= 6.2), but has one of the highest variations among the municipalities (S.D. = 2.5). Contractors are on the average expected to experience a relatively high degree of economic losses if the municipality terminate the contract prematurely (mean score = 7.5).

Table 41.
Evaluation of three transactional dimensions of market relations

Transactional dimension*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Level of market competition</i>	68	6.8	2.5
<i>Level of expected disturbances from sudden/unexpected failure from contractor</i>	69	6.2	2.5
<i>Level of contractor's expected economic loss from premature contract termination by municipality</i>	65	7.5	2.2

N = 69

The table reports the municipalities evaluations of three transactional dimensions of markets relations

* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'Very high degree').

Table 42 shows Swedish municipalities' evaluation of the degree of juridical/legal barriers/problems for using private contractors for provision of park and road maintenance. The degree of barriers/problems is measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors where 0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'very high degree'.

The degree of juridical/legal barriers is measured by three different items. '*Problems with finding the best possible private contractor*' attains the highest mean score (5.2) whereas '*Problems that has affected maintenance operations negatively*' attains the lowest mean score (3.5). However, the variation among municipalities in the degree of juridical/legal barriers/problems is relatively high (S.D. ranging from 3.3 to 3.0). The table shows that on the average Swedish municipalities some juridical/legal problems or barriers when using private contractors for provision of park and road maintenance.

Table 42.
Juridical / legal barriers for using private contractors (parks and roads)

Have juridical concerns and legal regulations given your municipality ...	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Problems with finding the best possible private contractor?</i>	67	5.2	3.2
<i>Problems with collaborating optimally with private contractors?</i>	66	4.8	3.3
<i>Problems that has affected maintenance operations negatively?</i>	58	3.5	3.0

N = 66

The table shows the level of juridical and legal problems with using private contractors of provision of road and park maintenance services.

* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = 'not at all' and 10 = 'Very high degree').

Contracts

Table 43 shows the number of contracts park and road departments in Swedish municipalities has with private contractors. In case of both parks and roads, a large part of the departments indicates that their department has three or more contracts with a private contractor (approximately 56 % for parks and 74 % for roads). Furthermore, no information is available on the number of private contractors for a relatively large part of the departments. Nine of the departments indicated that they have a contract which encompass both park and road maintenance services.

Table 43.
Number of contracts with private contractors

Number of contracts	Parks		Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
<i>One contract</i>	7	16.3%	8	12.3%
<i>Two contracts</i>	9	20.9%	7	10.8%
<i>Three contracts or more</i>	24	55.8%	48	73.9%
<i>No contracts</i>	3	7 %	2	3.1%
Total N (with data provided)*	43	100%	65	100%
Don't know	0		0	
Total N (all cases using private contractor)	53		83	

N = 43 (Parks), N = 65 (Roads)

The table shows the number of contracts with private contractors.

** Altogether nine municipalities indicated use of 'bundled contracts' comprising provision of both road and park maintenance by a single private contractor.*

Table 44 shows the distribution of ordinary contract period and the optional extension period for park maintenance contracts. The most common ordinary contract period is three years (in 18 cases) and the most common extension period is two years (in 21 cases). Only in few cases is the ordinary contract period indicated to be longer than three years (2 cases).

Table 44.
Contract length for park maintenance contracts.

Length (in years) *	Ordinary contract (N)	Option for extension (N)					Total (N)
		No option	One year	Two years	Three years	No data	
<i>One</i>	5	0	0	0	1	4	5
<i>Two</i>	7	0	0	5	1	1	7
<i>Three</i>	18	0	5	11	0	2	18
<i>Four</i>	3	0	2	1	0	-	3
<i>Five</i>	5	0	1	4	0	-	5
<i>Six</i>	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
Total	38	0	8	21	2	7	38

N = 38

The table reports about the contract length for park maintenance contracts

** Data on contract length for park maintenance contracts were provided for 38 municipalities out of 53 municipalities indicating use private contractors for provision of park maintenance.*

The Table below shows the distribution of ordinary contract period according to number of years and the optional extension period for road maintenance contracts. The most common ordinary contract period is three years (in 20 cases) and the most common extension period is two years (in 30 cases).

Table 45.
Contract length for road maintenance contracts.

Length (in years)*	Ordinary contract (N)	Option for extension (N)					Total (N)
		No option	One year	Two years	Three years	No data	
<i>One</i>	3	0	2	0	1	-	3
<i>Two</i>	17	0	2	13	0	2	17
<i>Three</i>	20	0	8	10	1	1	20
<i>Four</i>	7	1	3	3	0	0	7
<i>Five</i>	8	1	2	4	1	-	8
Total	55	2	17	30	3	3	55

N = 56

The table reports about the contract length for road maintenance contracts

** Data on contract length for road maintenance contracts were provided for 55 municipalities out of 83 municipalities indicating use of private contractors for provision of road maintenance.*

Table 46 shows the average contract period for parks and roads maintenance contracts. The average contract period is almost equal for parks and roads (respectively 2.9 and 3.0 years). The longest contract period for both parks and roads is 5 years. The average period for optional extension of the contract is 1.8 years for park maintenance contracts and 1.7 years for road maintenance contracts.

Table 46.
Average contract lengths (in years) for parks and roads maintenance contracts.

Statistics	Parks		Roads	
	Ordinary contract	Option for extension	Ordinary contract	Option for extension
N	38	31	55	52
Mean	2.9	1.8	3.0	1.7
S.D.	1.2	0.5	1.1	0.7
Minimum	1	1	1	0
Maximum	5	3	5	3

N = 38 (Parks), N = 55 (Roads)

The table reports the average contract lengths (in years) for parks and roads maintenance contracts.

OUTCOMES, EFFECTS AND PERFORMANCE

Summary

Performance of maintenance provision was measured for six performance dimensions on a scale from 0 (highly unsatisfied) to 10 (highly satisfied). Municipalities are on the average most satisfied with private contractor's performance of '*quality of maintenance services*' (mean score = 6.8 for parks and 7.1 for roads), '*flexibility and change*' (mean score = 7.2 for parks and 7.1 for roads) and '*follow-up and problem solving*' (mean score = 6.8 for parks and 6.8 for roads) in case of both park and road maintenance. Municipalities are least satisfied with private contractors performance of '*satisfaction of long-term service objectives*' in case of both park and road maintenance (mean score = 5.3 for parks and 6.0 for roads). No statistically significant differences are found between the mean scores for private contractors' provision of road and park maintenance services. Municipalities are generally satisfied with the in-house performance in provision of both park and road maintenance. The highest scores for satisfaction relates to '*Flexibility and change*' and '*quality of maintenance services*' in (mean scores ranging from 7.4 to 7.5). The lowest scores for satisfaction relates to '*Development and innovative thinking*' (mean score = 6.7 and 7.1 for respectively roads and parks) '*price and cost levels*' (mean score = 6.8 for both parks and roads).

In comparison, in-house provision of both park and road maintenance services receives higher mean scores than private provision does for all six performance dimensions. Statistical analysis for significance of differences for park maintenance services shows that the higher scores are statistically significant for four out of six performance dimensions ('*Quality of maintenance services*', '*Follow-up and problem-solving*', '*Development and innovative thinking*' and '*satisfaction of long term service objectives*'). The difference in '*price/cost levels*' and '*flexibility and change*' is not statistically significant. Statistical analysis for the significance of differences for road maintenance services shows that the higher scores for two out of the six performance dimensions are significant ('*follow-up and problem solving*' and '*satisfaction of long-term service objectives*'). The differences for the four other performance dimensions for road maintenance services are not statistically significant.

The effects from the use of private contractors on municipal planning and management of parks and road maintenance were evaluated for eight dimensions on a scale from 0 (affected very negatively) to 10 (affected very positively). The midpoint of the scale (= 5) indicates a neutral evaluation. Overall the effects are all evaluated as slightly positive or approximately neutral. The mean scores was highest for '*ability to get new ideas and think differently*' (mean score = 6.1) and

'management of maintenance operations' (mean score = 6.0) and lowest for *'ability to serve the political level'* (mean score = 5.2) and *'Ability to serve citizens and users'* (mean score = 5.3).

The average (un-weighted) cost change after the last procurement in those municipalities which contract out is found to be a 2.0 % decrease for park maintenance and a 3.1 % decrease for road maintenance. The average cost change for both park and road maintenance is a 2.7 % decrease.

Performance evaluations

Table 47 shows the evaluation of six performance dimensions of park and road maintenance services provided by private contractors. Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = ‘very unsatisfactory’ to 10 = ‘very satisfactory’.

Municipalities are on the average most satisfied with the ‘*quality of maintenance services*’ (mean score = 6.8 for parks and 7.1 for roads), ‘*flexibility and change*’ (mean score = 7.2 for parks and 7.1 for roads) and ‘*follow-up and problem solving*’ (mean score = 6.8 for parks and 6.8 for roads) in case of both park and road maintenance. Municipalities are least satisfied with ‘*satisfaction of long-term service objectives*’ in case of both park and road maintenance (mean score = 5.3 for parks and 6.0 for roads). No statistically significant differences are to be found between the scores for private contractors’ provision of road and park maintenance services at even modest levels ($p < .1$) when evaluated with paired samples t-tests.

Table 47.
Evaluations of private contractors’ provision of road and park maintenance services .

Performance dimension*	Park maintenance (N=48)			Road maintenance (N=71)		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
Quality of maintenance services	48	6.8	2.2	71	7.1	1.6
Price / cost levels	48	6.6	2.3	71	6.5	1.7
Flexibility and change	45	7.2	2.1	70	7.1	1.7
Follow-up and problem solving	44	6.8	2.1	71	6.8	1.8
Development and innovative thinking	43	5.9	2.1	68	6.2	2.0
Satisfaction of long-term service objectives	40	5.3	2.3	63	6.0	1.9

Total N = 48 (Parks). N = 71 (Roads)

The table reports the evaluation of six performance dimensions of park and road maintenance services provided by private contractors. Paired samples T-tests for each performance dimension shows no statistical significance at p-levels < .1 between road and park maintenance.

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘very unsatisfactory’ and 10 = ‘very satisfactory’).

Table 48 shows the differences between two groups of respondents' evaluation of private contractors' performance of park maintenance. The first group is respondents which department has direct responsibilities for provision of services (N = 31) and the second group is respondents which departments has no direct responsibility for (N = 17). Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfactory' to 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

Statistical analysis by one sample t-test shows no significant difference in the evaluation of performance between the groups with direct responsibilities and the groups with no direct responsibility.

Table 48.
Evaluation of private contractors' performance of park maintenance services by different types of respondents.

	Performance dimension*					
	Quality of maintenance services	Price / cost levels	Flexibility and change	Follow- up and problem solving	Development and innovative thinking	Satisfaction of long-term service objectives
Respondents with direct responsibilities for provision (N=31)						
N	31	31	30	30	29	26
Mean	6.6	6.5	7.1	6.6	5.8	5.3
S.D.	2.1	2.0	1.6	2.0	2.0	2.2
Respondents with no direct responsibilities for provision (N=17)						
N	17	17	15	14	14	14
Mean	7.0	6.7	7.5	7.1	6.0	5.4
S.D.	2.4	2.8	2.7	2.3	2.4	2.5
Significance levels for differences (between respondents' with direct and no direct responsibilities for provision)**						
Evaluation	None	None	None	None	None	None
Test statistics	t(46) = .590, p = .558	t(46) = .276, p = .784	t(43) = .714, p = .479	t(42) = .813, p = .421	t(41) = .296, p = .769	t(38) = .065 p = .949

Total N= 48

The table reports about the evaluation of private contractors' performance of park maintenance services by two different types of respondents.

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfactory' and 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

** Mean differences evaluated with independent samples T-tests at significance levels < .1 (low), < .05 (moderate) and < .01 (high).

Table 49 shows the differences between two groups of respondents' evaluation of private contractors' performance of road maintenance. The first group is respondents which department has direct responsibilities for provision of services (N = 51) and the second group is respondents which departments has no direct responsibility for (N = 20). Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfactory' to 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

Statistical analysis by one sample t-test shows no significant difference in the evaluation of performance between the groups with direct responsibilities and the groups with no direct responsibility.

Table 49.
Evaluation of private contractors' performance of road maintenance services by different types of respondents.

	Performance dimension*					
	Quality of maintenance services	Price / cost levels	Flexibility and change	Follow- up and problem solving	Development and innovative thinking	Satisfaction of long-term service objectives
Respondents with direct responsibilities for provision (N= 51)						
N	51	51	50	51	48	44
Mean	7.1	6.5	7.1	6.8	6.0	6.0
S.D.	1.3	1.7	1.6	1.8	2.1	1.9
Respondents with no direct responsibilities for provision (N=20)						
N	20	20	20	20	20	19
Mean	7.0	6.5	7.3	6.8	6.5	6.1
S.D.	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.7	2.0	2.0
Significance levels for differences (between respondents' with direct and no direct responsibilities for provision)**						
Evaluation	None	None	None	None	None	None
Test statistics	t(69) = -.352, p = .726	t(69) = .106, p = .916	t(68) = .544, p = .588	t(69) = -.113, p = .910	t(66) = .746, p = .458	t(61) = .241, p = .811

Total N=71

The table reports about the evaluation of private contractors' performance of road maintenance services by two different types of respondents

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfactory' and 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

** Mean differences evaluated with independent samples T-tests at significance levels < .1 (low), < .05 (moderate) and < .01 (high).

Table 50 shows the evaluation of private contractors' performance of park maintenance services at two different levels of contracting out. Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfactory' to 10 = 'very satisfactory'. At a contracting level around 90 % or more, private contractors receive higher means in the evaluation of four out of six performance dimensions than for contracting levels below 90 %. Statistical analysis shows no significant differences in the satisfaction of the private contractors' performance.

Table 50.
Evaluation of private contractors' performance of park maintenance services at different levels of contracting out

	Performance dimension*					
	Quality of maintenance services	Price / cost levels	Flexibility and change	Follow- up and problem solving	Development and innovative thinking	Satisfaction of long-term service objectives
Municipalities which contract out 90 % or more (N=11)						
N	11	11	11	11	11	11
Mean	7.1	7.6	7.2	6.6	6.5	6.2
S.D.	2.5	2.3	1.8	2.5	2.6	2.5
Respondents which contract out less than 90 % (N=33)						
N	33	33	30	29	28	25
Mean	6.9	6.3	7.4	7.0	5.6	5.3
S.D.	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.1
Significance levels for differences**						
Evaluation	None	None	None	None	None	None
Test statistics	t(42) = -.315, p = .754	t(42) = -1.660, p = .104	t(39) = .289, p = .774	t(38) = .549, p = .587	t(37) = -1.070, p = .292	t(34) = -1.062, p = .296

Total N= 44

The table reports about the evaluation of private contractors' performance of park maintenance services at different levels of contracting out.

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfactory' and 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

** Mean differences evaluated with independent samples T-tests at significance levels < .1 (low), < .05 (moderate) and < .01 (high).

Table 51 shows the evaluation of private contractors' performance of road maintenance services at two different levels of contracting out. Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfactory' to 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

At a contracting level around 90 % or more private contractors receive higher mean scores in the evaluation of all performance dimensions than for contracting levels below 90 % in most of the performance dimensions. Statistical analysis reveals significant difference in the satisfaction of the private contractors' performance for one out of six performance dimensions. The higher mean score in the evaluation of the satisfaction of '*price and cost levels*' for contracting levels around 90 % or more compared to contracting levels below 90 % are statistically significant.

Table 51.
Evaluation of private contractors' performance of road maintenance services at different levels of contracting out

	Performance dimension*					
	Quality of maintenance services	Price / cost levels	Flexibility and change	Follow- up and problem solving	Development and innovative thinking	Satisfaction of long-term service objectives
Municipalities which contract out 90 % or more (N=11)						
N	11	11	11	11	11	11
Mean	7.4	7.4	7.0	6.5	6.1	6.6
S.D.	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.1
Respondents which contract out less than 90 % (N=48)						
N	48	48	47	48	45	40
Mean	6.7	6.1	7.1	6.7	6.0	5.7
S.D.	1,7	1.8	1.8	1.9	2.2	2.0
Significance levels for differences**						
Evaluation	None	Moderate	None	None	None	None
Test statistics	t(57) = -1.178, p = .244	t(57) = -2.245, p = .029	t(56) = .112, p = .911	t(57) = .377, p = .708	t(54) = -.132, p = .896	t(49) = -1.321, p = .193

Total N= 59

The table reports about the evaluation of private contractors' performance of road maintenance services at different levels of contracting out.

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfactory' and 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

** Mean differences evaluated with independent samples T-tests at significance levels < .1 (low), < .05 (moderate) and < .01 (high).

Table 52 shows the scores for road and park departments in Swedish municipalities' satisfaction with the performance of in-house provision of road and park maintenance services. Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfactory' to 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

In general, the municipalities are highly satisfied with in-house provision of both park and road maintenance. '*Flexibility and change*' and '*quality of maintenance services*' in in-house provisions of park and road maintenance has the highest mean scores (mean scores ranging from 7.4 to 7.5). '*Development and innovative thinking*' in in-house provisions of road maintenance attains the lowest mean score (6.7) whereas '*price and cost levels*' in in-house provisions of park maintenance has the lowest mean score (6.8).

Table 52.
Evaluations of in-house provision of road and park maintenance services

Performance dimension	Park maintenance (N=58)			Road maintenance (N=60)		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
Quality of maintenance services	58	7.5	1.5	60	7.5	1.8
Price / cost levels	57	6.8	1.8	58	6.8	2.0
Flexibility and change	57	7.5	1.8	60	7.4	1.9
Follow- up and problem solving	58	7.3	1.9	59	7.3	2.2
Development and innovative thinking	58	7.1	2.2	60	6.7	2.4
Satisfaction of long-term service objectives	55	7.1	1.9	58	7.0	2.0

Total N=58 (parks). N = 60 (Roads)

The table reports the evaluation of six performance dimensions of park and road maintenance services provided in-house. Paired T-tests for each performance dimension shows no statistical significance at p-levels < .1 between road and park maintenance.

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfactory' and 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

Table 53 shows the differences between two groups of respondents' satisfaction with the performance for in-house provision of park maintenance. The first group is respondents which department has direct responsibilities for provision of services, i.e. carry out maintenance operations (N = 36) and the second group is respondents which departments has no direct responsibility for (N = 22). Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfactory' to 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

Statistical analysis by one sample t-tests reveals no statistically significant differences in the evaluation of performance between the groups.

Table 53.
Evaluation of in-house providers' performance of park maintenance services by different types of respondents

	Performance dimension*					
	Quality of maintenance services	Price / cost levels	Flexibility and change	Follow- up and problem solving	Development and innovative thinking	Satisfaction of long-term service objectives
Respondents with direct responsibilities for in-house provision (N=36)						
N	36	35	36	36	36	34
Mean	7.6	6.7	7.7	7.4	6.9	6.9
S.D.	1.6	2.0	1.8	2.0	2.4	2.2
Respondents with no direct responsibilities for in-house provision (N=22)						
N	22	22	21	22	22	21
Mean	7.4	7.1	7.3	7.2	7.3	7.4
S.D.	1.3	1.5	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.4
Significance levels for differences (between respondents' with direct and no direct responsibilities for provision)**						
Evaluation	None	None	None	None	None	None
Test statistics	t(56) = -.502, p = .618	t(55) = .783, p = .437	t(55) = -.670, p = .506	t(56) = .258, p = .798	t(56) = .725 p = .472	t(53) = .880, p = .383

Total N=58.

The table compares the evaluation by two types of respondents (respondents which department has direct responsibilities for provision and respondents which department have no responsibility for direct service provision) of performance of in-house provisions of park maintenance services.

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfactory' and 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

** Mean differences evaluated with independent samples T-tests at significance levels < .1(low), < .05 (moderate) and <.01 (high).

Table 54 shows the differences between two groups of respondents' satisfaction with the performance of in-house provision of road maintenance. The first group is respondents which department has direct responsibilities for provision of services, i.e. carry out maintenance operations (N = 44) and the second group is respondents which departments has no direct responsibility for (N = 16). Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfactory' to 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

Statistical analysis by one sample t-test reveals no statistically significant differences in the evaluation of performance between the groups.

Table 54.
Evaluations of in-house providers' performance of road maintenance services by different types of respondents

	Performance dimension*					
	Quality of maintenance services	Price / cost levels	Flexibility and change	Follow- up and problem solving	Development and innovative thinking	Satisfaction of long-term service objectives
Respondents with direct responsibilities for in-house provision (N=44)						
N	44	42	44	43	44	42
Mean	7.5	7.0	7.6	7.4	6.6	7.1
S.D.	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.1	2.3	2.0
Respondents with no direct responsibilities for in-house provision (N=16)						
N	16	16	16	16	16	16
Mean	7.3	6.4	7.0	6.9	7.1	6.9
S.D.	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.5	2.5	2.0
Significance levels for differences (between respondents' with direct and no direct responsibilities for provision)**						
Evaluation	None	None	None	None	None	None
Test statistics	t(58) = -.349, p = .728	t(56) = -.897 p = .374,	t(58) = -1.156 p = .253	t(57) = -.786, p = .435	t(58) = .738 p = .463	t(56) = -.331 p = .742

Total N=60.

The table compares the evaluation by two types of respondents (respondents which department has direct responsibilities for provision and respondents which department have no responsibility for direct service provision) of performance of in-house provisions of park maintenance services.

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfactory' and 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

** Mean differences evaluated with independent samples T-tests at significance levels < .1(low), < .05 (moderate) and <.01 (high).

Table 55 compares the municipalities' satisfaction with six performance dimensions of in-house and private provision of park maintenance services. Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfactory' to 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

For all performance dimensions, in-house provision receives higher mean scores than private provision does. Statistical analysis by one sample t-test shows that the higher scores are statistically significant for four out of six performance dimensions. The difference in '*price/cost levels*' and '*flexibility and change*' is not statistically significant (the p-values are respectively .393 and .156).

Table 55.
Comparison of municipalities' evaluation of performance of in-house and private provision of park maintenance services

	Performance dimensions of park maintenance					
	Quality of maintenance services	Price / cost levels	Flexibility and change	Follow- up and problem solving	Development and innovative thinking	Satisfaction of long-term service objectives
In-house provider	7.5	6.8	7.5	7.3	7.1	7.1
Private contractor	6.8	6.6	7.2	6.8	5.9	5.3
Significance levels for differences **						
Evaluation	High	None	None	Moderate	High	High
T-test statistics	t(57) = 3.786, p = .000	t(56) = .860, p = .393	t(56) = 1.439 p = .159	t(57) = 2.042 p = .046	t(57) = 4.024 p = .000	t(54) = 6.927 p = .000

N = 58

The table compare and report statistics on differences between performance evaluation by all respondents with in-house provisions with performance evaluations by all respondents with private provision of park maintenance services.

* Statistics based upon responses measured on an 11-point scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfying' and 10 = 'very satisfying').

** Mean differences evaluated with one sample T-tests at significance levels < .1 (low), < .05 (moderate), < .01 (High).

Table 56 compares the municipalities' satisfaction with performance of park maintenance services by in-house provision and the performance by private contractors in municipalities, which contract out 90 % or more. Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfactory' to 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

For five out of six performance dimensions, in-house provision receives higher mean scores than private provision in municipalities which contract out more than 90% does. Statistical analysis by one sample t-test shows that the higher scores are statistically significant except for '*flexibility and change*'. For one performance dimension, '*price / cost levels*', private contractors receive a higher average score (mean = 7.6) than in-house provision does (mean = 6.8). The difference is statistically significant ($p = .002$).

Table 56.
Comparison of municipalities' evaluation of performance of park maintenance services between in-house provision and the performance of private contractors in municipalities which contract out 90 % or more

	Performance dimensions of park maintenance*					
	Quality of maintenance services	Price / cost levels	Flexibility and change	Follow- up and problem solving	Development and innovative thinking	Satisfaction of long-term service objectives
In-house provision	7.5	6.8	7.5	7.3	7.1	7.1
Private contractor (contracted out 90 % or more)***	7.1	7.6	7.2	6.6	6.5	6.2
Significance levels for differences **						
Evaluation	Moderate	High	None	High	Low	High
T-test statistics	t(57) = 2.240, p = .029	t(56) = -3.295, p = .002	t(56) = 1.429, p = .156	t(57) = 2.843, p = .006	t(57) = 1.928, p = .059	t(54) = 3.446, p = .001

N = 58

The table compares differences between performance evaluations for all in-house provisions and the performance of private contractors for park maintenance service in municipalities which contract out 90 % or more.

* Statistics based upon responses measured on an 11-point scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfying' and 10 = 'very satisfying').

** Mean differences evaluated with one sample T-tests at significance levels < .1 (low), < .05 (moderate), < .01 (High).

*** category includes eleven cases

Table 57 compares the municipalities' evaluation of performance of road maintenance services between in-house provision and the performance of private contractors in municipalities which contract out 90 % or more. Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfactory' to 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

For five out of six performance dimensions, in-house provision receives higher mean scores than private provision in municipalities which contract out more than 90% does. Statistical analysis by one sample t-test shows that the higher scores received by in-house provision are statistically significant for performance dimensions '*follow-up and problem solving*' ($p < .01$) and '*development and innovative thinking*' ($p < .1$).

For one out of six performance dimensions, '*price / cost levels*', in-house provision receives lower mean scores than private provision in municipalities which contract out more than 90% does. The higher score received by private contractors is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Table 57.
Comparison of municipalities' evaluation of performance of road maintenance services between in-house provision and the performance of private contractors in municipalities which contract out 90 % or more.

	Performance dimensions of road maintenance*					
	Quality of maintenance services	Price / cost levels	Flexibility and change	Follow-up and problem solving	Development and innovative thinking	Satisfaction of long-term service objectives
In-house provision	7.5	6.8	7.4	7.3	6.7	7.0
Private contractor (contracted out 90 % or more)	7.4	7.4	7.0	6.5	6.1	6.6
Significance levels for differences **						
Evaluation	None	Moderate	None	High	Low	None
T-test statistics	t(59) = .212, p = .833	t(57) = -2.302, p = .025	t(59) = 1.662, p = .102	t(58) = 2.832, p = .006	t(59) = 1.891, P = .064	t(57) = 1.585, p = .118

N = 60

The table compares differences between performance evaluations for all in-house provisions and the performance of private contractors for road maintenance service in municipalities which contract out 90 % or more.

* Statistics based upon responses measured on an 11-point scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfying' and 10 = 'very satisfying').

** Mean differences evaluated with one sample T-tests at significance levels < .1 (low), < .05 (moderate), < .01 (High).

Table 58 compares the municipalities' evaluation of six performance dimensions of in-house and private provision of road maintenance services. Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = 'very unsatisfactory' to 10 = 'very satisfactory'.

For all six performance dimensions, in-house provision receives higher mean scores than private provision does. Statistical analysis by one sample t-test shows that the higher scores for two out of the six performance dimensions, '*follow-up and problem solving*' and '*satisfaction of long-term service objectives*', are statistically significant.

Table 58.
Comparison of Swedish municipalities' evaluation of performance of in-house and private provision of roads maintenance services.

	Performance dimensions of road maintenance					
	Quality of maintenance services	Price / cost levels	Flexibility and change	Follow- up and problem solving	Development and innovative thinking	Satisfaction of long-term service objectives
In-house provider	7.5	6.8	7.4	7.3	6.7	7.0
Private contractor	7.1	6.5	7.1	6.8	6.2	6.0
Significance levels for differences**	None t(59) = 1.484, p = .143	None t(57) = - 1.212, p = .231	None t(59) = 1.263, p = .212	Low t(58) = 1.777, p = .081	None t(59) = 1.567, sig. = .123	High t(57) = 3.865, p = .000

N=71

The table compares and reports statistics on differences between performance evaluations by all respondents with in-house provisions with performance evaluations by all respondents with private provision of road maintenance services.

*. Statistics based upon responses measured on a 11-point scale with anchors (0 = 'very unsatisfying' and 10 = 'very satisfying').

** Mean differences evaluated with one sample T-tests at significance levels < .1(low), < .05 (moderate), <.01 (high).

Cost effects

Table 59 shows the quantified economic effects from the municipalities' last round of procurement of park and road maintenance services. Estimates were provided for 30 municipalities in the case of park maintenance and for 48 municipalities in the case of road maintenance.

The average (un-weighted) cost change is a 2.0 % decrease for park maintenance and a 3.1 % decrease for road maintenance. The average cost change for both park and road maintenance is a 2.7 % decrease.

Table 59.
Quantified economic effects from contracting out after last procurement.

	Change in cost levels		
	Parks	Roads	Parks and Roads
N (valid)	30	48	78
Mean (un-weighted)	- 2.0 %	- 3.1 %	- 2.7 %
Std. dev.	11.7 %	15.5 %	14.0 %
Min. value (decrease)	-25 %	- 70 %	- 70 %
Max. value (increase)	30 %	50 %	50 %

N=78

The table reports about the quantified economic effects from contracting out after last procurement.

All data based on cases with self-reported estimates. Respondents were asked to provide estimates on the effect on the total price and cost level for services contracted out after the last round of procurement.

Figure 1. Sweden: Cost changes from last procurement to privates of park and road maintenance (N=78)




Table 60 shows the direction of self-reported estimates for cost change from the municipalities' last round of procurement of park and road maintenance services.

Table 60.
Direction of self-reported estimates on cost change from last times services were contracted out.

	Frequencies					
	Parks		Roads		Parks and Roads	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
N	52	100%	87	100%	139	100%
Decreased costs	9	17.3%	16	18.4%	25	18%
No cost change	15	28.8%	23	26.4%	38	27.3%
Increased costs	6	11.5%	9	10.3%	15	10.8%
Don't know	14	26.9%	17	19.5%	31	22.3%
No answer	8	15.4%	22	25.3%	30	21.6%

N = 139

The table reports about the direction of self-reported estimates on cost change from last times services were contracted out.

Data is based on the number of responses to questions on the effects on the total price and cost level for services contracted out after the last round of procurement for park and roads.

Table 61 shows the distribution of the direction in cost change in the last round of procurement of roads and parks maintenance according to the number of procurements in the past ten years. The table is based on data from all municipalities which provided estimates for the effect from the last round of procurement on costs levels for the procured parks and road maintenance services.


Estimates from 32 % of the municipalities indicated a decrease in costs. Estimates from 49 % of municipalities indicated no change in costs while estimates from 19% of the municipalities indicated a cost increase. In the group which had one round of procurement in the past ten years, the majority (50 %) indicated no cost change. In the group which had two rounds of procurement in the past ten years, the majority (46 %) indicated a cost decrease. In the group which had three rounds of procurement in the past ten years, the majority (48 %) indicated no cost change. In the group which had four rounds or more of procurement in the past ten years, the majority (61 %) indicated a no cost change, while 31% indicated a cost decrease and 8% indicated a cost increase.

Table 61.
Distribution of direction in cost change for contracting out roads and parks according to the number of procurements in the past ten years.

Number of procurements in the last ten years	Decreased costs		No cost change		Increased costs		Total (row)	
	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative	Absolute	Relative
<i>Four times or more</i>	11	31 %	22	61 %	3	8 %	36	100 %
<i>Three times</i>	6	24 %	12	48 %	7	28 %	25	100 %
<i>Two times</i>	6	46 %	2	15 %	5	39 %	13	100 %
<i>One time</i>	2	50 %	2	50 %	0	0 %	4	100 %
Total (row)	25	32 %	38	49 %	15	19 %	78	100 %

N=78

The table reports about the distribution of direction in cost change for contracting out roads and parks according to the number of procurements in the past ten years.



N=78.

Table 62 shows the direction of estimates for the economic effect from the use of partly or complete competitive tendering on the overall provision of park and road maintenance services. The table include the municipalities which indicated a use of competitive tendering of park and road maintenance services provided in-house.

47.1 % indicated a ‘don’t know’ for park services while 45.5% indicated a ‘don’t know’ for road services. For those municipalities which provided an estimate for park maintenance (N = 9) 3 out of 9 (equal to 33%) indicated a cost decrease while for those municipalities which provided an estimate for road maintenance 4 out of 12 (equal to 33%) indicated a cost decrease.

The majority of estimates for park and road services indicated a neutral cost effect (8 out of 21 cases equal to 38%). An almost equal amount indicates either decreased or increased costs (respectively 7 and 6 out of 21 or 33% and 29%).

Table 62.
Economic effects on overall service provision from competitive tendering.

Effect on internal cost levels*	Frequencies (relative / absolute)		
	Parks (N=17)	Roads (N=22)	Parks and Roads (N=39)
Increased	17.7 % (3)	13.6 % (3)	15.4 % (6)
Neutral	17.7 % (3)	22.7 % (5)	20.5 % (8)
Decreased	17.7 % (3)	18.2 % (4)	18.0 % (7)
Don't know	47.1 % (8)	45.5 % (10)	46.2 % (18)

N=39

* The table shows the distribution of categorized answers on questions related to the effect from the use of competitive tendering on the internal cost levels for in-house provisions of park and road maintenance services. A total of 36 municipalities indicated that they competitively tender parks and road maintenance services provided by the in-house provider.

Competition effects on service management and provisions

Table 63 shows Swedish municipalities' evaluation of the effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance.

On a scale from 0 (affected very negatively) to 10 (affected very positively), the effects are generally evaluated as neutral or slightly positive. The mean scores are highest for '*price and cost levels in service provisions*' and '*quality levels of service provisions*' (mean score = 5.9) and lowest for "*staff's well-being and work motivation*" (mean score = 5.2). The variations in the evaluations are largest for "*staff's well-being and work motivation*" (S.D. = 2.3) and "*flexibility in service provisions*" (S.D. = 2.2).

Table 63.
Effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance.

Dimension of in-house service provision*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Price and cost levels in service provisions</i>	22	5.9	2.4
<i>Quality levels in service provisions</i>	23	5.9	1.6
<i>Operational methods and routines for providing services</i>	24	5.8	1.8
<i>Flexibility in service provisions</i>	25	5.7	2.2
<i>Staff's well-being and work motivation</i>	23	5.2	2.3

N=25

The table reports about the effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance.

* The table shows findings generated from data for the following question. "In which degree do you find that competitive tendering has affected in-house service provisions negatively or positively regarding: price and cost levels, quality level, flexibility, operational methods, staff on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = 'affected very negatively' and 10 = 'affected very positively'".

Table 64 shows Swedish municipalities' evaluation of the effects from the use of private contractors on municipal planning and management of parks and road maintenance.

On a scale from 0 (affected very negatively) to 10 (affected very positively), the effects are all evaluated as slightly positive or approximately neutral. The mean scores are highest for '*ability to get new ideas and think differently*' (mean score = 6.1) and lowest for "*ability to serve the political level*" (mean score = 5.2). The variations in the evaluations are largest for "*management of maintenance budgets*" (S.D. = 1.9) and smallest for "*ability to get new ideas and think differently*" (S.D. = 1.4).

Table 64.
Effects from the use of private contractors on municipal management of parks and road maintenance.

Management dimension*	N	Mean	S.D.
<i>Ability to get new ideas and think differently</i>	69	6.1	1.4
<i>Management of maintenance operations</i>	69	6.0	1.8
<i>Organizational methods and routines</i>	68	5.8	1.6
<i>Management of maintenance budgets</i>	68	5.9	1.9
<i>Focus on planning and development of services</i>	69	5.9	1.5
<i>Information and knowledge on services</i>	69	5.9	1.6
<i>Ability to serve citizens and users</i>	68	5.3	1.5
<i>Ability to serve political level</i>	67	5.2	1.5

N=69

* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = 'affected very negatively' and 10 = 'affected very positively').

APPENDICES

SURVEY QUESTIONS

Bästa deltagare

I frågeformuläret nedan får du en rad frågor som rör er organisation och det sätt på vilket ni har organiserat drift (och underhåll) inom väg- och/eller parkområdet.

Frågeformuläret har utformats så att du endast får frågor om sådant som rör verksamheter som din avdelning ansvarar för och som rör det sätt som ni har organiserat driften.

Beroende på om du ansvarar för både väg- och parkområdet eller endast ett av dem, tar det mellan 10 och 20 minuter att besvara frågorna.

Om du skulle bli avbruten under tiden så kan du alltid vända tillbaka och fortsätta att svara via den länk som skickats till dig.

Tryck på "Nästa" och svara på den första frågan.

Nivån på din befattning i kommunen**Vilken av följande befattningsnivåer beskriver bäst din nuvarande position i din kommun**

Direktör/chef/ledare på förvaltningsnivå eller motsvarande (t.ex. "chef för teknisk förvaltning")	Ledare/chef på avdelnings-/central nivå eller motsvarande (t.ex. chef för "park- och natur")	Grupp-/teamledare eller motsvarande (t.ex. förman eller arbetsledare)	Medarbetare (inget ledningsansvar)	Annat (beskriv vad)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> __

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Vilka arbetsuppgifter ansvarar din avdelning för?

(Kryssa för de arbetsuppgifter som din avdelning har ansvar för eller sätt kryss om din avdelning inte har något ansvar för arbetsuppgifter inom ett område)

Arbetsuppgifter inom parkområdet

- ☐ Överordnad planering, strategi och utveckling (t.ex. översiktsplan och stadsplaner)
- ☐ Myndighetsuppgifter och administration (t.ex. lagstiftning)
- ☐ Överordnad driftsplanering (t.ex. arealregistrering, kvalitetsbeskrivningar, driftsplaner, beställning av driftsuppgifter)
- ☐ Kontroll och tillsyn av driftsuppgifter
- ☐ Det dagliga och praktiska utförandet av driftsuppgifter
- ☐ Överordnad budgetering och uppföljning av driftsbudgetar
- ☐ Min avdelning har inte något ansvar för uppgifter inom parkområdet

Beskriv eventuella andra ansvarsområden som din avdelning har inom parkområdet.

Uppgifter inom vägområdet

- ☐ Överordnad planering, strategi och utveckling (t.ex. översiktsplan och stadsplaner)
- ☐ Myndighetsuppgifter och administration (t.ex. lagstiftning)
- ☐ Överordnad driftsplanering (t.ex. arealregistrering, kvalitetsbeskrivningar, driftsplaner, beställning av driftsuppgifter)
- ☐ Kontroll och tillsyn av driftsuppgifter
- ☐ Det dagliga och praktiska utförandet av driftsuppgifter
- ☐ Överordnad budgetering och uppföljning av driftsbudgetar
- ☐ Min avdelning har inte något ansvar för uppgifter inom vägområdet

Beskriv eventuella andra ansvarsområden som din avdelning har inom vägområdet.

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Driftsbudgetar

Ange hur stor årlig budget i "runda tal" som du uppskattar att din avdelning respektive din kommun använder för driftsuppgifter inom...

(Ange uppskattad budget för innevarande år i milj. DKK, med max en decimal. Det är bättre om du ger ditt spontana bud än inget svar alls.)

Parkområdet

Min avdelning har en årlig driftsbudget
på ca: _____

Min kommun har en årlig driftsbudget på
ca: _____

Vägområdet

Min avdelning har en årlig driftsbudget
på ca: _____

Min kommun har en årlig driftsbudget på
ca: _____

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Vem löser driftsuppgifter för din avdelning:

(Sätt gärna ett kryss/flera kryss vid den typ av organisationer som din avdelning dagligen använder sig av för att lösa väsentliga driftsuppgifter)

Parkområdet

- ☐ Privata entreprenörer (SID. 8 TILL 26)
- ☐ Kommunal drift (t.ex. intern beställar-utförarmodell, 100 % självägt aktiebolag, intern drift, o.likn.) (SID. 28 TILL 40)
- ☐ Gemensamt ägt kommunalt bolag/entreprenör
- ☐ Annan offentlig myndighet
- ☐ Gemensamt ägt offentligt-privat bolag/entreprenör
- ☐ Annan typ av organisation

Vägområdet

- ☐ Privata entreprenörer (SID. 8 TILL 26)
- ☐ Kommunal drift (t.ex. intern beställar-utförarmodell, 100 % självägt aktiebolag, intern drift, o.likn.) (SID. 28 TILL 40)
- ☐ Gemensamt ägt kommunalt bolag/entreprenör
- ☐ Annan offentlig myndighet
- ☐ Gemensamt ägt offentligt-privat bolag/entreprenör
- ☐ Annan typ av organisation

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Fördelning av driftsbudget**Hur fördelas din avdelnings budget för driftsuppgifter mellan olika typer av organisationer?**

(Ange uppskattad fördelning i 0-100 procent av den totala budgeten för driften i olika organisationer för innevarande år. Det är bättre att ange en uppskattad fördelning än inget svar.)

Parkområdet

(Summan ska uppgå till totalt 100)

Privata entreprenörer	_____
Kommunal drift	_____
Gemensamt ägt kommunalt bolag/entreprenör	_____
Annan offentlig myndighet	_____
Gemensamt ägt offentligt-privat bolag/entreprenör	_____
Annan typ av organisation (beskriv kort denna i fältet nedan)	_____

Vägområdet

(Summan ska uppgå till totalt 100)

Privata entreprenörer	_____
Kommunal drift	_____
Gemensamt ägt kommunalt bolag/entreprenör	_____
Annan offentlig myndighet	_____
Gemensamt ägt offentligt-privat bolag/entreprenör	_____
Annan typ av organisation (beskriv kort denna nedan)	_____

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Nedan ställer vi en rad frågor som handlar om er användning av privata företag/entreprenörer för driften av park- och/eller vägområdet i er kommun.

Formella avtal för samarbetet

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning följande utgör en central del av din avdelnings samarbete(n) med privat(a) entreprenör(er)

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycket hög grad 10	Vet ej
Formaliserade och nerskrivna bestämmelser av juridisk karaktär (t.ex. ett undertecknat kontrakt)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Beskrivning av uppgifterna som omfattar överordnade mål, funktioner och riktlinjer för drift och utveckling av områden och anläggningar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Beskrivning av uppgifterna som omfattar detaljerade krav på skick och utförande samt mängdangivelser	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bestämmelser om sanktionsmöjligheter om driften inte lever upp till avtalad kvalitet och mängd	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Avtal om nära samarbete och gemensam planering av drift och utveckling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Avtal om att den privata entreprenören/de privata entreprenörerna ska ha direkt kontrakt med medborgare och användare (t.ex. genom dialog med skolor, förskolor/fritids eller brukarråd).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Avtal om särskild ekonomisk ram med incitament för optimering, förbättring och investeringar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Krav på expertis och kompetenser (t.ex. krav på viss bakgrund såsom yrke eller utbildning)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Tillfredsställelse med privat parkdrift

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 hur nöjd eller missnöjd du är med det arbete som den privata entreprenören/de privata entreprenörerna utför inom parkområdet för er avdelning vad gäller:

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet ej
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfyllande av era långsiktiga mål för områden och anläggningar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra relevanta omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med (beskriv i fältet nedan)?												

Tillfredsställelse med privat vägdrift

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 hur nöjd eller missnöjd du är med det arbete som den privata entreprenören/de privata entreprenörerna utför inom vägområdet för er avdelning vad gäller:

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet ej
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfyllande av era långsiktiga mål för områden och anläggning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra relevanta omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med (beskriv i fältet nedan)?												

Uppfattningar om samarbetet med privata

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande påståenden kännetecknar förhållandet mellan din avdelning och den privata entreprenören/de privata entreprenörerna)?

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
Vi är båda av uppfattningen att det är nödvändigt att samarbeta för att var och en av oss ska kunna uppnå sina mål	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi engagerar oss båda för att den andra parten ska uppnå sina mål	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är båda redo att ändra på omständigheter i driften, om det underlättar arbetet för den ena parten	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ingen av oss skulle utnyttja en svaghet eller ett fel hos den andra till egen fördel	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi anser båda att det går bra att vara skyldiga varandra en tjänst	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Oberoende av vem som bär ansvar för ett misstag, så anser vi båda att lösningen på problem är ett gemensamt ansvar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Möjlighet att styra privata

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande påståenden kännetecknar din avdelnings möjlighet att styra er(a) privata entreprenör(er) i driften?

	Inte alls 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycke t hög grad 10	Vet ej
Om driften inte lever upp till ett krav som avtalats (t.ex. kvalitetsnivån) så använder vi gärna "hårda" bötes- och sanktionsmöjligheter (t.ex. avdrag på betalning)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi träffas ofta och talar om driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är måna om att driften lever upp till det underlag (t.ex. kvalitetskrav eller arbetsmängder) som vi har beskrivit i våra driftskontrakt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi har fokus på samarbete för att uppfylla de strategiska målen för områden och anläggningar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Användning av anbud

Hur många gånger har driftsuppgifter inom de områden och anläggningar som din avdelning ansvarar för upphandlats genom anbudsförfarande under de senaste tio åren?

Parkområdet

- ☐ 1 gång
- ☐ 2 gånger
- ☐ 3 gånger
- ☐ 4 gånger eller fler
- ☐ vet ej

Vägområdet

- ☐ 1 gång
- ☐ 2 gånger
- ☐ 3 gånger
- ☐ 4 gånger eller fler
- ☐ vet ej

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

"Kvalitet på upphandlings- och kontraktmaterial"

Vilket av följande påståenden anser du bäst beskriver ert upphandlings- och kontaktmaterial?

- ☐ Påstående A: Vårt upphandlings- och kontraktmaterial är i stort sett bra och vi förväntar oss endast att det krävs mindre anpassningar/ändringar för en kommande offentlig upphandling.
- ☐ Påstående B: Vårt upphandlings- och kontraktmaterial är i stort sett bra men kan ändå förbättras och vi förväntar oss att en del anpassningar/ändringar behövs för en kommande offentlig upphandling.
- ☐ Påstående C: Vårt upphandlings- och kontraktmaterial bör förbättras och vi förväntar oss att det krävs betydande anpassningar/ändringar för en kommande offentlig upphandling.
- ☐ Påstående D: Vårt upphandlings- och kontraktmaterial är dåligt och bör på det stora hela bytas ut för en kommande offentlig upphandling.
- ☐ Påstående E: Vet ej

"Kvalitet på uppgiftsbeskrivningen"

Vilket av följande påståenden anser du bäst beskriver era uppgiftsbeskrivningar?

- ☐ Påstående A: Våra uppgiftsbeskrivningar är i stort sett bra och vi förväntar oss endast att det krävs mindre anpassningar/ändringar för en kommande offentlig upphandling.
- ☐ Påstående B: Våra uppgiftsbeskrivningar är i stort sett bra men kan fortfarande förbättras och vi förväntar oss att en del anpassningar/ändringar behövs för en kommande offentlig upphandling.
- ☐ Påstående C: Våra uppgiftsbeskrivningar bör förbättras och vi förväntar oss att det krävs betydande anpassningar/ändringar för en kommande offentlig upphandling.
- ☐ Påstående D: Våra uppgiftsbeskrivningar är dåliga och bör på det stora hela bytas ut för en kommande offentlig upphandling.
- ☐ Påstående E: Vet ej

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Ekonomiska effekter av senaste offentliga upphandlingen

Hur mycket billigare eller dyrare räknat i procent uppskattar du att de upphandlade driftsuppgifterna har blivit efter den senaste upphandlingen?

(Överväg förändringar för era totala beräknade kostnader för driften före och efter upphandlingen)

Parkområdet

Totalt sett har driften av de upphandlade uppgifterna hamnat på ungefär:

_____ % billigare

_____ % dyrare

☐ Varken billigare eller dyrare

☐ Vet ej

Beskriv de orsaker som du anser har påverkat skillnaden i era kostnader för driften före och efter upphandlingen (beskriv även gärna orsaker om driften varken blivit dyrare eller billigare).

Eventuella kommentarer till din uppskattning:

Vägområdet

Totalt sett har driften av de upphandlade uppgifterna hamnat på ungefär:

_____ % billigare

_____ % dyrare

☐ Varken billigare eller dyrare

☐ Vet ej

Beskriv de orsaker som du anser har påverkat skillnaden i era kostnader för driften före och efter upphandlingen (beskriv även gärna orsaker om driften varken blivit dyrare eller billigare).

Eventuella kommentarer till din uppskattning

Antal driftskontrakt

Hur många driftskontrakt har din avdelning ingått med privata företag?

Parkområdet

- ☐ Inget
- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4 eller fler

Vägområdet

- ☐ Inget
- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4 eller fler

Har ni ingått ett samlat kontrakt för väg- och parkområdet?

- ☐ Ja
- ☐ Nej
- ☐ Vet ej

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Kontraktstid (antal år)

Hur lång är kontraktstiden och möjligheten till förlängning (option) vanligtvis för din avdelnings driftskontrakt med privata?

(Om ni har flera driftskontrakt med olika längd, ange längden på de(t) viktigaste driftskontraktet/-n.)

Parkområdet

Den avtalade kontraktstiden är _____

Ev. möjlighet till förlängning av kontraktstiden (option) är på _____

Vägområdet

Den avtalade kontraktstiden är _____

Ev. möjlighet till förlängning av kontraktstiden (option) är på _____

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Kontrollbud

Har kommunen utarbetat ett kontrollbud i för upphandling av driftsuppgifter?
(med kontrollbud avses en beräkning av vad det skulle kosta om kommunen själv utför uppgifterna)

- ☐ Nej
- ☐ Ja
- ☐ Vet ej

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Marknadssituationen och driftssäkerhet

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande påståenden beskriver "marknadssituationen" för de driftsuppgifter som ni upphandlar?

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
Får ni vanligtvis tillräckligt med kvalificerade anbud (konkurrens) för de uppgifter som ni upphandlar?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Skulle ni utan väsentliga störningar i driften eller ekonomiska konsekvenser kunna hitta en ny entreprenör för att lösa driftsuppgifter om de(n) nuvarande entreprenören/-erna plötsligt sviker?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tror du att det skulle innebära en ekonomisk förlust för den privata entreprenören/de privata entreprenörerna om din avdelning/kommun oväntat säger upp driftskontraktet/-n i förtid?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Planering/utarbetande av upphandlingsförfrågan

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande metoder används när ni planerar/utarbetar anbudsförfrågan för driftsuppgifter

	Inte alls 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I myck et hög grad 10	Vet ej
Grundligt gjorda analyser av vad marknaden kan erbjuda används	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grundliga analyser av egna erfarenheter används	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rådgivning från externa konsulter/rådgivare används	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grundliga analyser av andra kommuners erfarenheter används	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grundliga analyser av upphandlingstekniska och juridiska möjligheter används	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Uppgifternas tydlighet och kontrollbarhet

Ange i närmaste procentandel i vilken omfattning du uppskattar att den drift som har överlåtits till privata entreprenörer omfattar uppgifter som i praktiken är...

Parkområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan föregående gemensam planering och dialog	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Vägområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan förutgående gemensam planering och dialog	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

"Styrningskapacitet"

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande påståenden beskriver din avdelnings kapacitet för administration och styrning av den del av driften som har överlåtits till de(n) privata entreprenören(erna)

	Inte alls 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycket hög grad 10	Vet ej
Vi har tillräckliga organisatoriska resurser (t.ex. tid och personal) för administration och styrning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi har tillräckliga erfarenheter och kunskaper om administration och styrning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi har tillräckliga verktyg, metoder och system (t.ex. GIS och IT-system) för administration och styrning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi har tillräckliga (gemensamma) rutiner och procedurer för administration och styrning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Organisatoriska effekter från samarbete med privata

I hur stor utsträckning anser du att användningen av och/eller samarbete med privata entreprenörer har påverkat din avdelning positivt eller negativt vad gäller...

	Påverka t mycket negativt	1	2	3	4	Varken eller	6	7	8	9	Påverka t mycket positivt	Vet ej
	0					5					10	
... era arbetsmetoder och rutiner	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... er kunskap och information om förhållandena i områden och anläggningar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... er förmåga att tänka nytt och annorlunda	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... ert fokus på planering och utveckling av områden och anläggningar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... er styrning av driftsuppgifterna	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... er styrning av driftsekonomi	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... er förmåga att använda er av den politiska nivån i kommunen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... er förmåga att använda er av medborgare och användare	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Beskriv eventuellt andra viktiga erfarenheter ni har haft med privata entreprenörer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Erfarenheter från användning av privata entreprenörer

I hur många år kan du minnas att din avdelning som minimum har använt privata entreprenörer i driften?

Ca år _____

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Intern uppbackning för användning av privata entreprenörer

Ange på en skala från 1 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att användningen av privata entreprenörer i driften (av de områden och anläggningar som din avdelning ansvarar för) är...

	Inte alls 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycke t hög grad 10	Vet ej
... ett internt politiskt önskemål i kommunen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... ett internt önskemål i förvaltningen i kommunen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... en ständig politisk debatt internt i kommunen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... ständigt debatteras internt i förvaltningen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Syftet med användning av privata entreprenörer

Ange på en skala från 1 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande syften utgör en central del av kommunens överväganden för att använda privata entreprenörer i driften (av de områden och anläggningar som din avdelning ansvarar för)

Syftet är...

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycke t hög grad 10	Vet ej
... att uppnå en hög kvalitet i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... att uppnå en billig drift	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... att uppnå en effektiv styrning av driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... att marknads testa och jämföra priserna för driftsuppgifter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... att få utfört driftsuppgifter som kommunen inte direkt kan lösa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... att utveckla och förnya områden och anläggningar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... att utveckla vår interna organisation och arbetsmetoder	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nämn andra eventuella syften och/eller motiv som du anser vara viktiga	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Lagstiftning och användning av privata entreprenörer

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att gällande lagstiftning och regler ger problem vid följande omständigheter

	Inte alls 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I myck et hög grad 10	Vet ej
Har gällande lagstiftning och regler inneburit problem för er att hitta den bästa entreprenören för att lösa era driftsuppgifter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Har gällande lagstiftning och regler inneburit problem för er att kunna arbeta optimalt med de privata entreprenörerna om lösning av driftsuppgifterna?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Har omständigheter av juridisk karaktär gett er problem (t.ex. rättsärenden och tvister) som har påverkat utförandet av driftsuppgifter negativt?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Nedan ställer vi en rad frågor till den del av driften som organiseras i kommunens regi inom väg- och/eller parkområdet (t.ex. intern drift, via beställar-utförarmodell, självägt kommunalt aktiebolag o. liknande).

Styrverktyg för den kommunala driften

Vilken av följande styrverktyg använder kommunen för ledning och organisering av den kommunala driften inom väg- och/eller parkområdet?

	Ja	Nej	Vet ej
Företagsplaner (t.ex. angivande av huvuduppgifter, strategi, utvecklingsmål, ekonomi m.m.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Skiljer mellan ansvar för "beställning" av driftsuppgifter och ansvaret för "utförande" av driftsuppgifter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Självständig budget och årsräkenskaper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Självständig ledning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Separat kontroll och tillsyn av hur driftsuppgifterna utförs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Konkurrensutsättande av uppgifter (helt eller delvis)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Möjlighet att få in den interna driftsleverantören till uppgifter hos andra "kunder" (t.ex. skolor, institutioner eller andra kommuner)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Organisering som 100 % kommunalt ägt aktiebolag	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Avskilja driften från andra uppgifter

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning det kommunala utförandet av driftsuppgifter är organisatoriskt åtskilt från följande uppgifter

("organisatoriskt åtskilt" innebär här att det dagliga ansvaret för en uppgift är tydligt placerat och löses i en annan organisatorisk enhet/förvaltning än den som utför driftsuppgiften, exempelvis som uppgiftsfördelningen i en typisk beställar-utförarmodell, vid upprättande av ett kommunalt aktiebolag som sköter driften eller vid en uppdelning mellan interna underavdelningar).

På parkområdet

	Inte alls 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycke t hög grad 10	Vet ej
Överordnad planering, strategi och utveckling (t.ex. översiktsplan och stadsplaner)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Myndighetsuppgifter och administration (t.ex. enligt lagstiftning)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Överordnad driftsplanering (t.ex. arealregistrering, kvalitetsbeskrivningar, driftsplaner, beställning av driftsuppgifter)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kontroll och tillsyn av driften (utöver egenkontroll i driften)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Överordnad budgetering och uppföljning av driftsbudgetar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

På vägområdet

	Inte alls 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycke t hög grad 10	Vet ej
Överordnad planering, strategi och utveckling (t.ex. översiktsplan och stadsplaner)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Myndighetsuppgifter och administration (t.ex. enligt lagstiftning)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Överordnad driftsplanering (t.ex. arealregistrering kvalitetsbeskrivningar, driftsplaner, beställning av driftsuppgifter)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kontroll och tillsyn av driften (utöver egenkontroll i driften)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Överordnad budgetering och uppföljning av driftsbudgetar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Syftet med kommunal drift

Ange på en skala från 1 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande syften är en central del av kommunens överväganden för att använda kommunal drift (inom de områden och anläggningar som din avdelning ansvarar för)

Syftet är...

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycket hög grad 10	Vet ej
att uppnå en hög kvalitet i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
att uppnå en billig drift	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
att uppnå en effektiv styrning av driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
att uppnå en flexibel drift (t.ex. att kunna ändra i driften efter behov)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
att kunna jämföra priserna för driftsuppgifter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
att få utfört driftsuppgifter som inte kan lösas av andra	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
att utveckla och förnya områden och anläggningar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
att utveckla vår interna organisation och arbetsmetoder	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
att säkra goda arbetsförhållanden	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
att bevara förmågan att lösa driftsuppgifter ("försörjningstrygghet")	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
att säkra demokratisk styrning och kontroll	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nämn andra eventuella syften och/eller motiv som du anser vara viktiga	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Tillfredsställelse med kommunal drift (vägområdet)

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 hur nöjd eller missnöjd du är med den kommunala driften inom vägområdet vad gäller...

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet ej
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfyllandet av era långsiktiga mål för områden och anläggning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Tillfredsställelse med kommunal drift (parkområdet)

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 hur nöjd eller missnöjd du är med den kommunala driften inom parkområdet vad gäller...

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet inte
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande i driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfyllande av era långsiktiga mål för områden och anläggning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Syn på till samarbetet

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande beskrivningar kännetecknar den interna synen inom kommunen på den kommunala driften (inom park- och/eller vägområdet)?

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
Alla är av uppfattningen att det är nödvändigt att samarbeta för att var och en av oss ska uppnå sina mål	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alla engagerar sig för att alla parter ska uppnå sina mål	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är redo att ändra på omständigheter i driften, om det underlättar arbetet för den ena eller den andra parten	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ingen av oss skulle utnyttja en svaghet eller ett fel hos den andra till egen fördel	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alla är av uppfattningen att det går bra att vara skyldiga varandra en tjänst	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alla anser att oberoende av vem som har ansvar för ett misstag, så är lösningen på problemet ett gemensamt ansvar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Möjlighet att styra intern drift

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande påståenden kännetecknar möjligheten att styra den kommunala driften

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycke t hög grad 10	Vet ej
Om driften inte lever upp till ett krav som avtalats (t.ex. kvalitetsnivån) så använder vi gärna "hårda" bötes- och sanktionsmöjligheter (t.ex. avdrag på betalning)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är måna om att driften lever upp till det underlag (t.ex. kvalitetskrav eller arbetsmängder) som vi har beskrivit i våra driftskontrakt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi träffas ofta och talar om driften	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vi har fokus på att samarbeta för att uppfylla strategiska mål för områden och anläggningar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Totala ekonomiska effekter från konkurrensutsättning

Hur mycket räknat i procent uppskattar du att den totala driften (er avdelnings områden och anläggningar) har blivit billigare eller dyrare på grund av konkurrensutsättningen?

(Överväg både förändringar i era beräknade kostnader för själva driftsuppgifterna och er administration av driftsuppgifterna)

Parkområdet

Totalt sett har driften blivit ca

_____ % billigare

_____ % dyrare

☐ Varken billigare eller dyrare

☐ Vet ej

Beskriv eventuellt vilka orsaker du anser har påverkat driften så att den blivit dyrare/billigare på grund av konkurrensutsättning

Eventuella kommentarer till din uppskattning

Vägområdet

Totalt sett har driften blivit ca

_____ % billigare

_____ % dyrare

☐ Varken billigare eller dyrare

☐ Vet ej

Beskriv eventuellt vilka orsaker du anser har påverkat driften så att den blivit dyrare/billigare på grund av konkurrensutsättning

Eventuella kommentarer till din uppskattning

Effekter vid konkurrensutsättning av kommunal drift

Ange i hur stor utsträckning du anser att konkurrensutsättning har påverkat den kommunala driften positivt eller negativt vad gäller...

	Påverka t mycket negativt										Påverka t mycket positivt	Vet ej
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
... pris- och kostnadsnivå i uppgiftslösningen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... kvalitetsnivå i uppgiftslösningen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... flexibilitet i uppgiftslösningen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... metoder och rutiner som används i uppgiftslösningen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... medarbetarnas trivsel och arbetsglädje	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Uppgifternas tydlighet och kontrollbarhet

Ange i närmaste procentandel i vilken omfattning du uppskattar att de uppgifter som utförs i den kommunala driften i praktiken är...

Parkområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan förutgående gemensam planering och dialog	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Vägområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan förutgående gemensam planering och dialog	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Uppbackning för kommunal drift

Ange på en skala från 1 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att användningen av kommunal drift för de områden och anläggningar som din avdelning har ansvar för är...

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycke t hög grad 10	Vet ej
... ett internt politiskt önskemål i kommunen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... ett internt önskemål i förvaltningen i kommunen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... en ständig politisk debatt internt i kommunen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... ständigt debatteras internt i förvaltningen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Erfarenheter från kommunal drift

I hur många år kan du minnas att din avdelning som minimum har använt kommunal drift?

Ca _____ år

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Nedan ställer vi en rad frågor som handlar om er användning av ett gemensamt kommunalt bolag/entreprenör för driftsuppgifter inom väg- och/eller parkområdet.

Erfarenheter från användning av gemensam kommunal entreprenör/bolag. I hur många år kan du minnas att din avdelning som minimum har använt gemensam kommunal entreprenör/bolag i driften?

Ca år

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Syftet med att använda gemensamt kommunalt bolag/entreprenör

Ange på en skala från 1 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande syften är en central del av kommunens överväganden för att använda gemensamt kommunalt bolag/entreprenör i driften av de områden och anläggningar som din avdelning ansvarar för

Syftet är...

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycket hög grad 10	Vet ej
...att uppnå en hög kvalitet i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en billig drift	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en effektiv styrning av driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en flexibel drift (t.ex. att kunna ändra i driften efter behov)	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att marknadstesta och/eller jämföra priserna för driftsuppgifter	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
... att få utfört driftsuppgifter som kommunen inte själv kan lösa	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att utveckla och förnya områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att utveckla vår interna organisation och arbetsmetoder	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
... att uppnå stordriftsfördelar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
... att undvika kommunsammanslagning	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Nämn andra eventuella syften och/eller motiv som du anser vara viktiga	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Tillfredsställelse med gemensamt kommunalt bolag/entreprenör (parkområdet)

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 hur nöjd eller missnöjd du är med det arbete som det gemensamma kommunala bolaget/entreprenören inom parkområdet utför vad gäller...

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet ej
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande av driften av era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfylllandet av era långsiktiga mål för era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med?	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Tillfredsställelse med gemensamt kommunalt bolag/entreprenör (vägområdet)

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 hur nöjd eller missnöjd du är med det arbete som det gemensamma kommunala bolaget/entreprenören inom vägområdet utför vad gäller...

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet ej
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande av driften av era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfylllandet av era långsiktiga mål för era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med?	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Syn på samarbetet

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande beskrivningar kännetecknar förhållandet mellan din avdelning och den gemensamma kommunala entreprenören?

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
Vi är båda av uppfattningen att det är nödvändigt att samarbeta för att var och en av oss ska kunna uppnå sina mål	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi engagerar oss båda i att den andra parten uppnår sina mål	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är båda redo att ändra på omständigheter i driften, om det underlättar arbetet för den ena parten	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Ingen av oss skulle utnyttja en svaghet eller ett fel hos den andra till egen fördel	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi anser båda att det går bra att vara skyldiga varandra en tjänst	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Oberoende av vem som bär ansvar för ett misstag, så är lösning av problemen ett gemensamt ansvar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Möjlighet att styra

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande påståenden kännetecknar er möjlighet att styra den gemensamma kommunala entreprenören i driften?

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
Om driften inte lever upp till ett krav som avtalats (t.ex. kvalitetsnivån) så använder vi gärna "hårda" bötes- och sanktionsmöjligheter (t.ex. avdrag på betalning)	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi träffas ofta och talar om driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är måna om att driften lever upp till det underlag (t.ex. kvalitetskrav eller arbetsmängder) som vi har beskrivit i våra driftskontrakt	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi har fokus på att samarbeta för att uppfylla de strategiska målen för områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Uppgifternas tydlighet och kontrollbarhet

Ange i närmaste procentandel i vilken omfattning du uppskattar att de uppgifter som utförs av det gemensamma kommunala bolaget/entreprenören i praktiken är...

Parkområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan föregående gemensam planering och dialog	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>

Vägområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan föregående gemensam planering och dialog	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Nedan ställer vi en rad frågor om er användning av den externa offentliga entreprenören för driftsuppgifter inom väg- och/eller parkområdet.

Erfarenheter från användning av extern offentlig entreprenör. I hur många år kan du minnas att din avdelning som minimum har använt gemensam extern offentlig entreprenör i driften?

Ca år

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Syftet med att använda extern offentlig entreprenör

Ange på en skala från 1 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande syften är en central del av kommunens överväganden för att använda en extern offentlig entreprenör i driften av de områden och anläggningar som din avdelning ansvarar för

Syftet är...

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
...att uppnå en hög kvalitet i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en billig drift	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en effektiv styrning av driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en flexibel drift (t.ex. att kunna ändra i driften efter behov)	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att marknadstesta och/eller jämföra priserna för driftsuppgifter	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
... att få utfört driftsuppgifter som kommunen inte själv kan lösa	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att utveckla och förnya områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att utveckla vår interna organisation och arbetsmetoder	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Nämn andra eventuella syften och/eller motiv som du anser vara viktiga	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Nöjd med extern offentlig entreprenör

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 hur nöjd eller missnöjd du är med det arbete som den externa offentliga entreprenören utför:

Inom parkområdet vad gäller...

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet ej
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande av driften av era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfyllandet av era långsiktiga mål för era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med?	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

inom vägområdet vad gäller...

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet ej
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande av driften av era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfyllandet av era långsiktiga mål för era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med?	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Syn på samarbetet

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande beskrivningar kännetecknar förhållandet mellan din avdelning och den externa offentliga entreprenören

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad Vet ej
Vi är båda av uppfattningen att det är nödvändigt att samarbeta för att var och en av oss ska kunna uppnå sina mål	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi engagerar oss båda i att den andra parten uppnår sina mål	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är båda redo att ändra på omständigheter i driften, om det underlättar arbetet för den ena parten	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>
Ingen av oss skulle utnyttja en svaghet eller ett fel hos den andra till egen fördel	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi anser båda att det går bra att vara skyldiga varandra en tjänst	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>
Oberoende av vem som bär ansvar för ett misstag, så är lösning av problemen ett gemensamt ansvar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Möjlighet att styra

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande påståenden kännetecknar din avdelnings möjlighet att styra den externa offentliga entreprenören i driften

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
Om driften inte lever upp till ett krav som avtalats (t.ex. kvalitetsnivån) så använder vi gärna "hårda" bötes- och sanktionsmöjligheter (t.ex. avdrag på betalning)	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi träffas ofta och talar om driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är måna om att driften lever upp till det underlag (t.ex. kvalitetskrav eller arbetsmängder) som vi har beskrivit i våra driftskontrakt	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi har fokus på att samarbeta för att uppfylla de strategiska målen för områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Uppgifternas tydlighet och kontrollbarhet

Ange i närmaste procentandel i vilken omfattning du uppskattar att de driftsuppgifter som utförs av den externa offentliga entreprenören för din avdelning i praktiken är...

Parkområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan föregående gemensam planering och dialog	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>

Vägområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan föregående gemensam planering och dialog	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Nedan ställer vi en rad frågor som handlar om er användning av en gemensamt ägd offentlig-privat entreprenör för väg- och/eller parkområdet för driftsuppgifter.

Erfarenheter från användning av offentligt-privat bolag. I hur många år kan du minnas att din avdelning som minimum har använt offentligt-privat bolag i driften?

Ca år

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Syftet med att använda offentligt-privat bolag

Ange på en skala från 1 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande syften är en central del av kommunens överväganden för att använda en gemensamt ägd offentlig-privat entreprenör i driften (inom de områden och anläggningar som din avdelning ansvarar för)

Syftet är...

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
...att uppnå en hög kvalitet i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en billig drift	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en effektiv styrning av driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en flexibel drift (t.ex. att kunna ändra i driften efter behov)	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att marknadstesta och/eller jämföra priserna för driftsuppgifter	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
... att få utfört driftsuppgifter som kommunen inte själv kan lösa	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att utveckla och förnya områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att utveckla vår interna organisation och arbetsmetoder	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Nämn andra eventuella syften och/eller motiv som du anser vara viktiga												

Nöjd med offentligt-privat bolag

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 hur nöjd eller missnöjd du är med det arbete som den gemensamt ägda offentliga-privata entreprenören utför:

Inom parkområdet vad gäller:

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet ej
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande av driften av era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfyllandet av era långsiktiga mål för era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med?												

Inom vägområdet vad gäller...

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet ej
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande av driften av era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfyllandet av era långsiktiga mål för era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med?	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Syn på samarbetet

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande beskrivningar kännetecknar förhållandet mellan din avdelning och den gemensamt ägda offentliga-privata entreprenören

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
Vi är båda av uppfattningen att det är nödvändigt att samarbeta för att var och en av oss ska kunna uppnå sina mål	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi engagerar oss båda i att den andra parten uppnår sina mål	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är båda redo att ändra på omständigheter i driften, om det underlättar arbetet för den ena parten	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Ingen av oss skulle utnyttja en svaghet eller ett fel hos den andra till egen fördel	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi anser båda att det går bra att vara skyldiga varandra en tjänst	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Oberoende av vem som bär ansvar för ett misstag, så är lösning av problemen ett gemensamt ansvar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Möjlighet att styra

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande påståenden kännetecknar din avdelnings möjlighet att styra den gemensamma offentliga-privata entreprenören i driften

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
Om driften inte lever upp till ett krav som avtalats (t.ex. kvalitetsnivån) så använder vi gärna "hårda" bötes- och sanktionsmöjligheter (t.ex. avdrag på betalning)	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi träffas ofta och talar om driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är måna om att driften lever upp till det underlag (t.ex. kvalitetskrav eller arbetsmängder) som vi har beskrivit i våra driftskontrakt	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi har fokus på att samarbeta för att uppfylla de strategiska målen för områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Uppgifternas tydlighet och kontrollbarhet

Ange i närmaste procentandel i vilken omfattning du uppskattar att de driftsuppgifter som den gemensamt ägda offentligt-privata entreprenören utför för din avdelning i praktiken är...

Parkområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan föregående gemensam planering och dialog	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>

Vägområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan föregående gemensam planering och dialog	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Nedan ställer vi en rad frågor som handlar om er användning av annan typ av organisation inom väg- och/eller parkområdet

Erfarenheter från användning av annan typ av organisation

I hur många år kan du minnas att din avdelning som minimum har använt annan typ av organisation i driften?

Ca år

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Syftet med att använda annan typ av organisation

Ange på en skala från 1 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande syften är en central del av kommunens överväganden för att använda en annan typ av organisation i driften (inom de områden och anläggningar som din avdelning ansvarar för)

Syftet är...

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
...att uppnå en hög kvalitet i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en billig drift	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en effektiv styrning av driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att uppnå en flexibel drift (t.ex. att kunna ändra i driften efter behov)	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att marknads testa och/eller jämföra priserna för driftsuppgifter	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
... att få utfört driftsuppgifter som kommunen inte själv kan lösa	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att utveckla och förnya områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
...att utveckla vår interna organisation och arbetsmetoder	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Nämn andra eventuella syften och/eller motiv som du anser vara viktiga												

Tillfredsställelse med annan typ av organisation

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 hur nöjd eller missnöjd du är med det arbete som den andra typen av organisation utför:

Inom parkområdet vad gäller:

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet ej
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande av driften av era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfyllandet av era långsiktiga mål för era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med?	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Inom vägområdet vad gäller...

	Mycket missnöjd 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mycket nöjd 10	Vet ej
Den genomgående kvaliteten i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Den genomgående pris- och kostnadsnivån i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibilitet vad gäller önskemål om ändringar och/eller förbättringar i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljning och lösning av problem och brister i driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Utveckling och nytänkande av driften av era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Uppfyllandet av era långsiktiga mål för era områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Finns det andra omständigheter som du är nöjd/missnöjd med?	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Syn på samarbetet

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande beskrivningar kännetecknar förhållandet mellan din avdelning och den andra typen av organisation

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
Vi är båda av uppfattningen att det är nödvändigt att samarbeta för att var och en av oss ska kunna uppnå sina mål	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi engagerar oss båda i att den andra parten uppnår sina mål	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är båda redo att ändra på omständigheter i driften, om det underlättar arbetet för den ena parten	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Ingen av oss skulle utnyttja en svaghet eller ett fel hos den andra till egen fördel	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi anser båda att det går bra att vara skyldiga varandra en tjänst	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Oberoende av vem som bär ansvar för ett misstag, så är lösning av problemen ett gemensamt ansvar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Möjlighet att styra

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur stor utsträckning du anser att följande beskrivningar kännetecknar er möjlighet att styra i driften av den andra typen av organisation

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 I mycket hög grad	Vet ej
Om driften inte lever upp till ett krav som avtalats (t.ex. kvalitetsnivån) så använder vi gärna "hårda" bötes- och sanktionsmöjligheter (t.ex. avdrag på betalning)	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi träffas ofta och talar om driften	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi är måna om att driften lever upp till det underlag (t.ex. kvalitetskrav eller arbetsmängder) som vi har beskrivit i våra driftskontrakt	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>
Vi har fokus på att samarbeta för att uppfylla de strategiska målen för områden och anläggningar	(0) <input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Uppgifternas tydlighet och kontrollbarhet

Ange i närmaste procentandel i vilken omfattning du uppskattar att de driftsuppgifter som andra typer av organisationer utför i praktiken är...

Parkområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan föregående gemensam planering och dialog	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>

Vägområdet

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	Vet ej
... övervägande svåra att utöva tillsyn över/kontrollera kvaliteten på	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande svåra att utföra tillfredsställande utan föregående gemensam planering och dialog	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>
... övervägande lätta att beskriva klart och tydligt	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <input type="checkbox"/>	(6) <input type="checkbox"/>	(7) <input type="checkbox"/>	(8) <input type="checkbox"/>	(9) <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) <input type="checkbox"/>	(12) <input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Vem bör utföra driftsuppgifterna i framtiden?

Ange i procent i vilken omfattning du anser att följande typer av organisationer bör utföra era driftuppgifter i framtiden

Parkområdet

Privata entreprenörer	_____ %
Kommunal drift	_____ %
Gemensamt ägt kommunalt bolag/entreprenör	_____ %
Annan offentlig myndighet	_____ %
Gemensamt ägt offentligt-privat bolag/entreprenör	_____ %
Annan typ av organisation	_____ %

Vägområdet

Privata entreprenörer	_____ %
Kommunal drift	_____ %
Gemensamt ägt kommunalt bolag/entreprenör	_____ %
Annan offentlig myndighet	_____ %
Gemensamt ägt offentligt-privat bolag/entreprenör	_____ %
Annan typ av organisation	_____ %

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Allmänna omständigheter

Ange på en skala från 0 till 10 i hur hög grad du anser att följande omständigheter gäller för din avdelning

	Inte allt 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	I mycke t hög grad 10	Vet ej
Har din avdelnings ramvillkor och uppgifter (t.ex. politiska prioriteringar, lagkrav eller önskemål från användare) förändrats under de senaste fem åren?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Förväntar du att din avdelnings ramvillkor och uppgifter (t.ex. politiska prioriteringar, lagkrav eller önskemål från användare) kommer att förändras under de kommande fem åren?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Har din avdelnings budgetar totalt sett varit under press de senaste fem åren?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Förväntar du att din avdelnings budgetar totalt sett kommer att vara under press under de kommande fem åren?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ange ev. kommentarer till ditt svar här:

Till sist vill vi gärna ställa några frågor om din bakgrund och anställning

I hur många år har du totalt varit anställd i
den kommun där du f.n. har din
anställning?

I hur många år har du totalt varit anställd
inom offentlig förvaltning?

Vilket år är du född?

Ditt kön?

Vill du ha en sammanfattning av undersökningens resultat när den är klar?

- ☐ Ja
- ☐ Nej

Tack för ditt deltagande!

SURVEY INVITATIONS AND FOLLOW-UP LETTERS

History

Initial invitation, 19. May 2015 (all contacts)

First reminder, 1. June 2015 (non-responding contacts)

First reminder, 1. June 2015 (partial completed)

Second reminder, 17. juni, 2015 (non-responding contacts).

First invitation, 19, May 2015.**Bäste ...,**

Du är inbjuden att delta i en ny forskningsbaserad enkätundersökning av erfarenheter av olika former av organisation och ledning av driften av kommunala parker och gator i Danmark, Norge, Sverige och England. Undersökningen har kommit till stånd genom ett samarbete mellan Förvaltningshögskolan vid Göteborgs Universitet, Sveriges Lantbruksuniversitet, Alnarp, Transportøkonomisk Institutt, Norge, Aalborg Universitet i Danmark och Dalgas Innovation och förvaltas av Aalborgs universitet.

Studien kommer att ge viktig forskningsbaserad information som vi räknar ska bli ett intressant inlägg i debatten om utvecklingen av organisation och ledning av park- och gatuverksamhet i kommunerna.

Klicka på länken nedan för att börja.

<%MorpheusMailLink%>

I slutet av enkäten är det möjligt att beställa en rapport med resultaten, som kommer att skickas direkt via e-post när dessa föreligger. Undersökningens resultat kommer även att spridas i rapporter och relevanta facktidsskrifter.

Beroende på om du svarar för både parker och gator eller endast en av dem kommer det att ta mellan 15 och 20 minuter att genomföra enkäten.

Delaktighet och svar behandlas 100% anonymt. Ingen information kommer att publiceras så att den kan hänföras till enskilda individer eller kommuner.

Om tekniska problem uppstår eller om du har några frågor om undersökningen är du välkommen att kontakta adjungerad professor Andrej Christian Lindholst acl@dps.aau.dk Aalborgs universitet telefon 0045 28 72 85 20.

Vi ser fram emot ditt deltagande!**Med vänliga hälsningar,**

Ylva Noren Bretzer, Universitetslektor,
Förvaltningshögskolan vid Göteborgs Universitet

Bengt Persson, Samverkanslektor,
Sveriges Lantbruksuniversitet SLU, Alnarp

Morten Balle Hansen, Professor och Andrej Christian Lindholst, Adjungerad professor,
Aalborg Universitet, Danmark.

First reminder, 1. June, 2015**Bäste ...,**

Den 19 maj skickade vi en inbjudan till dig att delta i en enkät om organisation och styrning av driftverksamheten inom vägar och parker i kommuner i Sverige, Danmark, Norge och England.

Hittills har vi fått svar från cirka 75 av Sveriges 290 kommuner.

Vi har ännu inte fått svar från din kommun.

Det är viktigt för undersökningens användbarhet och tillförlitlighet och för nyttan av de svar vi redan fått in att så många som möjligt besvarar den enkät vi skickat ut.

Det finns fortfarande möjlighet att besvara enkäten genom att klicka på nedanstående länk.

<%MorpheusMailLink%>

Sista dag att besvara enkäten är den 15 juni.

Vi ser fram emot ditt deltagande!**Med vänliga hälsningar,**

...

First reminder (partial completed), 1, June, 2015.

Bäste ...,

Den 19. maj skickade vi en inbjudan till dig att delta i en enkät om organisation och styrning av driftverksamheten inom vägar och parker i kommuner i Sverige, Danmark, Norge och England.

Hittills har vi fått svar från cirka 75 av Sveriges 290 kommuner.

Du har delvis besvarat enkäten och vi är tacksamma för de svar du hittills har gett.

Det är viktigt för undersökningens användbarhet och tillförlitlighet och för nyttan av de svar vi redan fått in att du besvarar alla eller i stort sett alla frågor i enkäten.

Du har än så länge möjlighet att besvara de frågor som hittills är obesvarade genom att klicka på nedanstående länk.

<%MorpheusMailLink%>

I enkätformuläret kan du flytta dig fram och tillbaka till hittills obesvarade frågor genom att klicka på knapparna ”föregående” och ”nästa”).

Sista dag för komplettering av enkäten är den 15 juni.

Tack för ditt engagemang så här långt och vi ser fram emot en komplett ifylld enkät från dig.

Med vänliga hälsningar,

...

Second reminder, 17, June, 2015.

Bäste ...,

Vi har tidigare bjudit in dig att delta i en enkät om organisation och styrning av driftverksamheten inom vägar och parker i kommuner i Danmark, Sverige, Norge og England.

Hittills har vi fått svar från x av Sveriges 290 kommuner. Vi har dessvärre inte fått något komplett svar från din kommun.

Det är mycket viktigt för undersökningens användbarhet och nyttan av de svar som kommit in från andra kommuner att vi även får svar från din kommun.

Vi hoppas därför att du vill delta i undersökningen. Vi behöver ditt svar senast den 1. juli.

Tryck på länken nedan för att börja.

<%MorpheusMailLink%>

Undersökningen har kommit till stånd genom ett samarbete mellan Förvaltningshögskolan vid Göteborgs Universitet, Sveriges Lantbruksuniversitet, Alnarp, Transportøkonomisk Institutt, Norge, Aalborg Universitet i Danmark och Dalgas Innovation och förvaltas av Aalborgs universitet.

Studien kommer att ge viktig forskningsbaserad information som vi räknar ska bli ett intressant inlägg i debatten om utvecklingen av organisation och ledning av park- och gatuverksamhet i kommunerna.

I slutet av enkäten är det möjligt att beställa en rapport med resultaten, som kommer att skickas direkt via e-post när dessa föreligger. Undersökningens resultat kommer även att spridas i rapporter och relevanta facktidsskrifter.

Beroende på om du svarar för både parker och gator eller endast en av dem kommer det att ta mellan 15 och 20 minuter att genomföra enkäten.

Delaktighet och svar behandlas 100% anonymt. Ingen information kommer att publiceras så att den kan hänföras till enskilda individer eller kommuner.

Om du inte är rätt person att besvara enkäten sätter vi stort värde på om du skickar denna inbjudan vidare till den som bör besvara den.

Om tekniska problem uppstår eller om du har några frågor om undersökningen är du välkommen att kontakta adjungerad professor, Andrej Christian Lindholst acl@dps.aau.dk vid Aalborgs universitet telefon 0045 28 72 85 20.

Vi ser fram emot ditt deltagande!

Med vänliga hälsningar,